DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 076 EA 025 719

TITLE Report of the Governor's Task Force on School Construction.
INSTITUTION Maryland State Interagency Committee on School Construction, Baltimore.
PUB DATE 30 Jul 93
NOTE 95p.; For a related document, see ED 189 685.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Committees; *Construction Programs; Costs; *Educational Facilities Planning; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *School Buildings; *Standards; *State Action
IDENTIFIERS *Maryland

ABSTRACT

In October 1992, Maryland Governor William Donald Schaefer established a 21-member task force to conduct an in-depth study and review 8 specific areas of the state's public school construction program. This report summarizes the committee's activities, findings, and recommendations. The first recommendation, to review project requests from the 24 local school systems for the next 5 to 10 years, was based on findings concerning projected enrollment increases, aging and outmoded facilities, and plans for year-round facilities use. Additional recommendations include reviewing the state/local shared-cost formula; investigating alternative funding sources for forward funded projects; reviewing the state rate-capacity formula for elementary schools; and reviewing the state policies for funding pre-kindergarten programs and educational facilities. The policies and procedures of the Public School Construction Program should be reviewed to ensure that: (1) all projects comply with state and local growth management plans and policies; (2) existing public school buildings are properly maintained; and (3) newly-constructed facilities will meet the needs of students, educators, and the business community into the 21st century. Also, the Public School Construction Program funding level should be reviewed. Appendices contain the Governor's executive order, construction program rules and regulations, historical background, costs, capital improvement comparisons, public school enrollments and capacities, and other relevant data. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Y. Stenzler
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 368 076

EA

REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

JULY 30, 1993

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

EA 025719

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REPORT

OF THE

GOVERNOR'S

TASK FORCE

ON

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Interagency Committee on School Construction
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
(410) 333-2500

GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Sidney Kramer, Chairperson
President, Kramer Enterprises

Senator Clarence W. Blount
Chairman, Economic and
Environmental Affairs Committee

Mr. Ronald Bowers
Vice President
Washington County Commissioners

Mr. Edward Burger
Senior Vice President
Whiting Turner Contracting Co.

Ms. Winnie Carpenter
Parent

Delegate Gene W. Counihan
Vice Chairman
Ways and Means Committee

Senator Arthur Dorman
Vice Chairman, Economic and
Environmental Affairs Committee

Dr. Charles I. Ecker
County Executive
Howard County

Dr. Noel T. Farmer, Jr.
Superintendent
Frederick County Public Schools

Dr. R. Allan Gorsuch
Superintendent
Caroline County Public Schools

Dr. Nancy S. Grasmick
State Superintendent of Schools

Mr. Ronald Kreitner
Director
Maryland Office of Planning

Mr. Vincent Leggett
President
Anne Arundel Co. Board of Ed.

The Honorable Lucille Maurer
State Treasurer

Mr. Kevin Quinn
Principal, Alex Brown & Sons

Delegate Howard P. Rawlings
Chairman
Appropriations Committee

Ms. Eileen M. Rehrmann
County Executive
Harford County

Ms. Diane Smith
Director of Nursing
Arcola Nursing & Rehab Ctr.

Mr. Robert Swann
Assistant State Comptroller

Mr. Edward Todd
President
Todd & Assoc., Inc., Architects

Mr. Martin W. Walsh, Jr.
Secretary of General Services

Staff for The Task Force

- Ms. Anne Ferro, Department of Fiscal Services
- Ms. Barbara Strein, Maryland Office of Planning
- Dr. Yale Stenzler, Interagency Committee on School Construction

Staff assistance and report preparation

- Mrs. Ruth Baber, Interagency Committee on School Construction
- Ms. Libby Cain, Department of Fiscal Services
- Ms. Carol Larkin, Interagency Committee on School Construction
- Ms. Patty Ludwig, Interagency Committee on School Construction

For information concerning content or
for copies of this report, contact:

Interagency Committee on School Construction
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore Maryland 21201
(410) 333-2500

GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

July 30, 1993

The Honorable William Donald Schaefer
Governor
Executive Department
Annapolis MD 21404

Dear Governor Schaefer,

On behalf of the members of The Governor's Task Force on School Construction I am pleased to present this report to you. In the ten months since you established the Task Force we held ten meetings with over half in various parts of the State to obtain information, suggestions, and proposals from representatives of local school systems, local governments, and other interested parties.

The members of the Task Force studied and reviewed each of the eight (8) specific topics you identified. The thirty-nine (39) recommendations presented within the report are arranged under each of these eight subjects and a ninth item was added that pertains to the recommended level of State funding for the School Construction Program.

The implementation of these recommendations should enable the State of Maryland to continue its excellent record of commitment and support for public school construction projects in the 24 school systems. These recommendations address the current and projected needs of our school systems while considering State and local financial resources.

I wish to thank all of the individuals throughout the State who took the time to present testimony to the Task Force which greatly assisted us in our work. I also commend each member of the Task Force for honoring their commitment to this activity and for their participation during the meetings that led to these recommendations.

I want to thank Dr. Yale Stenzler and the other staff members for their willing support of the Task Force. Their knowledge of the history of the State's participation in capital programs and unstinting commitment of time were essential to our deliberations.

We hope that these recommendations will be of assistance to you as the combined efforts and resources of State and local governments continue to provide the highest quality of educational facilities for the children and citizens of our State.

The members of the Task Force are available at your convenience to discuss and review this report and to assist in the implementation of the recommendations.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sidney Kramer

Sidney Kramer, Chairperson
Governor's Task Force on
School Construction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Task Force Membership	i
Letter of Transmittal	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Executive Summary	v
Introduction	1
Task Force Activities	2
The Public School Construction Program	3
Information Presented	5
Options and Conclusions	5
Findings and Facts with Recommendations	6
Review of school construction needs	7
State/local shared cost formula	10
State funding for Forward Funded projects	12
State Rated Capacity for elementary schools	13
Pre-Kindergarten facilities	14
State and local growth management	14
Maintenance of public school buildings	16
Educational facilities for the 21st Century	17
State funding levels for school construction	18
Concluding Statements	19
Appendices	21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

On October 7, 1992 Governor William Donald Schaefer signed Executive Order 01.01.1992.21 which established the Governor's Task Force on School Construction. This 21 member Task Force was charged to conduct an in-depth study and review of the Public School Construction Program. Eight (8) specific areas of study were identified by the Governor in the Executive Order. The Task Force held ten meetings. Six of these meetings were held in different parts of the State to provide opportunities for local boards of education, local governments, and other interested parties to present their concerns, suggestions, and/or proposals for changes and improvements to the Public School Construction Program.

Recommendations

The thirty-nine (39) recommendations that follow are based upon the information presented to the Task Force by staff, invited guests, and over 60 individuals and/or organizations that addressed the Task Force. The recommendations are grouped under each of the eight (8) specific areas of study identified by the Governor and a ninth item was added that pertains to a recommended level of State funding for the Public School Construction Program.

1. Review the project requests from the 24 local school systems for the next 5-10 year period.

   1A The Maryland State Board of Education has established performance standards for all public schools. The Interagency Committee should encourage the planning and funding of projects that enhance and support the implementation of these standards.

   1B The Interagency Committee should require each school system to study former school buildings that have been closed due to declining enrollments for their potential reuse as a public school building. This would include former public school buildings that are used for other educational purposes by the board of education and former public school buildings that have been transferred to the local government. In the case of buildings transferred to local government, this analysis should include the fiscal and public service impacts of reuse for public schools, as determined by the local government and the school board.

1C The Interagency Committee should require each school system to review for closure, consolidation or redistricting any school which operates at less than 60% of the rated capacity for more than 2 consecutive school years.

1D The Interagency Committee should increase the eligible square footage in the Capacity and Space Formula for elementary schools by 5% to provide additional space now required for expanded educational programs and services that were not provided in 1976 when the existing formula was established. It is further recommended that the Interagency Committee should study the square footage requirements for middle schools and high schools.

1E The Interagency Committee should establish a new priority category which specifically encourages and supports local school systems to implement State and local educational initiatives through the submission of smaller renovation or addition projects. This would be a new priority #4 for educational initiatives such as: pre-kindergarten, science, technology education, and Maryland School Performance Program projects in "special assistance" schools.

1F The Interagency Committee should develop incentives for any school system and county government that jointly adopt a long-term commitment to a year-round school schedule (180 days) or any other scheduling method that enhances educational objectives and decreases the need for additional educational facilities.

1G The Interagency Committee should continue its activities and work closely with the Department of General Services, local boards of education, and county governments to develop cost saving techniques and procedures to more efficiently utilize the State and local funds committed to public school construction projects. This includes clearinghouse functions pertaining to the selection of materials, design and construction techniques, contract administration, and preparation of bid documents. Discussions and workshops with architects, engineers, contractors, subcontractors, and school system facility planners to improve the planning, design, and construction process should continue on a regular basis.

1H The Interagency Committee should encourage local education agencies and county governments to utilize value engineering and/or construction management to assure that projects are designed and constructed economically without sacrificing functions and capabilities. The Interagency Committee should

participate in these costs. Furthermore, they should develop materials and information which describes the process; suggest criteria for the selection of value engineering consultants; suggest methods of implementation; act as a clearinghouse to share proposals from value engineering consultants and the project architect's response; and identify cost effective and efficient design and construction techniques, supplies, materials, and equipment.

1I The Interagency Committee should have legislation introduced to delete Section 5-308 Asbestos Removal Fund from the Education Article. The program has not been funded or implemented since passage in 1985.

1J The Interagency Committee should continue to review projects for eligibility based upon projected enrollments. This review includes a study of adjacent schools to assure full utilization of all facilities.

1K The Interagency Committee and the Maryland Office of Planning should serve as a resource for local governments interested in (a) developing Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances to monitor, direct, and control growth; and (b) Impact Fees to provide funding for capital projects required to meet growth and development.

1L The Interagency Committee should continue to fund modular construction projects and enable local boards of education to utilize State owned relocatable classroom buildings.

2. Review the State/local shared cost formula.

2A The Board of Public Works should revise the State/local shared cost formula to provide seven funding levels between 50% - 70% with 80% as an exception for Somerset County, the only jurisdiction above 75% (50, 55, 60, 65, 70, 75, 80). These figures are based upon the three year average of State funding for Aid to Education - Basic Current Expenses for FY'92-FY'94. The new levels should be utilized for Public School Construction Program funding for FY'95-FY'99 and appropriate adjustments made for all school systems. (See the chart on page viii)

2B The Interagency Committee should establish a new priority category for systemic renovation projects. This should be a new priority #5. State funding for systemic renovation projects should be based upon the State/local shared cost formula (equalization factor) rather than the current funding method (percentage) which is related to the age of the system or component being replaced.

2C The Interagency Committee should continue to provide funding for appropriately financed lease-lease back projects and work with local education agencies and local governments to explore and implement other innovative funding techniques.

Chart for Recommendation 2A

STATE/LOCAL SHARED COST FORMULA (1)

	Existing	Proposed
Allegany County	65	75
Anne Arundel County	55	50
Baltimore City	75	75
Baltimore County	50	50
Calvert County	50	55
Caroline County	75	75
Carroll County	65	65
Cecil County	75	70
Charles County	65	65
Dorchester County	65	70
Frederick County	65	65
Garrett County	75	70
Harford County	65	65
Howard County	50	50
Kent County	55	50
Montgomery County	50	50
Prince George's County	55	60
Queen Anne's County	55	55
St. Mary's County	65	70
Somerset County	75	80 (2)
Talbot County	50	50
Washington County	65	65
Wicomico County	65	70
Worcester County	50	50

(1) percent State share

(2) This is an exception to the current policy of 50% - 75% State funding for public school construction projects. The three year average of the State Share Percentage of Basic Current Expenses for Somerset County exceeds 75%, and an increase to the next increment is warranted.

3. Investigate alternative funding sources for Forward Funded projects.

3A As general funds ("pay-go") become available, the Board of Public Works and the Maryland General Assembly should approve State funding to reimburse the five (5) jurisdictions for the seven (7) forward funded projects which were previously approved for planning by the Board of Public Works and then for those projects which were deferred because of fiscal constraints and were, therefore, not approved for planning.

3B The Interagency Committee with assistance from the Comptroller and the Treasurer should continue to investigate State funding options for reimbursement for forward funded projects that are undertaken in the future within the limitations imposed by Federal laws, rules, and/or regulations.

3C The Interagency Committee should encourage the Maryland General Assembly to adopt legislation which would enable any jurisdiction to undertake interim debt financing for State approved forward funded projects for which State funding may be temporarily unavailable because of State fiscal constraints.

4. Review the State Rated Capacity formula for elementary schools.

4A The Interagency Committee should revise the State Rated Capacity (SRC) for elementary schools to more closely reflect actual staffing and class size at the elementary school level. Revise kindergarten from 25 to 22 and grades 1-5/6 from 30 to 25.

5. Review the State policies and procedures for funding pre-Kindergarten programs and educational facilities.

5A The Interagency Committee with the approval of the Board of Public Works should revise the Capacity and Space Formula to provide space for pre-kindergarten students in support of the State policy to provide funding for pre-kindergarten classes and programs. The formula should be adjusted to add the following for each space based upon full-time equivalent enrollment:

Pre-Kindergarten : 20

6. Review the policies, practices and/or procedures of the Public School Construction Program to assure that all projects comply with State and local growth management plans and policies.

6A The Interagency Committee should require local boards of education to address the adopted Comprehensive Plan of the local jurisdiction in the Educational Facility Master Plan which is submitted annually.

6B The Interagency Committee should require that the local government body as certified by the planning board, commission, or director, as appropriate, provide a written statement as part of the Educational Facility Master Plan which states that the plan is consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan of the local jurisdiction.

6C Existing public school buildings should be renovated whenever possible and economical to (a) retain the school building within the neighborhood or community and (b) preserve and enhance prior State and/or local investments. If the Interagency Committee and Board of Public Works determine that a school should be renovated rather than replaced and the local board of education and local government decide to proceed with a replacement school, then the project would not be eligible for State funding in excess of the projected cost of the renovation project.

6D The Interagency Committee should continue to work closely with the Maryland Office of Planning and the Interagency Economic Growth, Resource Protection, and Planning Committee in the review of the local board of education's selection of school sites, project approval, and site development requirements.

6E The Interagency Committee should continue to work with the Department of General Services, the Maryland State Department of Education, and local boards of education to plan, design, construct, and operate energy efficient public school buildings.

7. Review the policies, practices and/or procedures of the Public School Construction Program to assure that existing public school buildings are properly maintained by the public school systems and local fiscal authorities.

7A The Interagency Committee should continue to require the submission of a Comprehensive Maintenance Plan with annual updates from local boards of education.

7B The Interagency Committee should continue to collect, review, and analyze financial expenditure data for maintenance from the local boards of education. Any concerns or problems should be reported to the Board of Public Works and local government.

7C The Interagency Committee should continue to inspect selected public schools each year and report their findings to local boards of education and local governments. The Interagency Committee should continue to require that appropriate corrective action be taken.

7D The maintenance of public schools is a local responsibility. State funding for systemic renovation projects should only be provided for critical projects which will extend the useful life of the facility.

7E The Interagency Committee should provide funding for small systemic renovation projects costing less than $100,000 but more than $50,000. This would enable subdivisions with smaller existing schools to apply for systemic renovation funding. The same criteria and funding formula would apply. This fund source would only be available for a jurisdiction that did not have any requests for projects exceeding $100,000 in estimated costs. The total amount to be allocated for this purpose in any given year would not exceed $500,000.

7F The Interagency Committee and the Board of Public Works should continue to have the authority to withhold State school construction funds if a specific building or group of buildings are not properly maintained. This action would be taken after the local board of education and local government have been notified.

7G The Interagency Committee should continue to serve as a resource for local education agencies providing training and disseminating information that would be beneficial to the local education agencies.

8. Review the policies, practices and/or procedures of the Public School Construction Program to assure that the facilities being designed and constructed will meet the needs of students, educators and the business community into the 21st century.

8A The Interagency Committee should continue to keep abreast of current educational programs and technology changes which would impact on the planning, design, and construction of public school buildings. The IAC should disseminate appropriate information to the local education agencies.

8B The Interagency Committee should continue to work closely with the Maryland State Department of Education, local educators, and the business community to review and analyze proposed changes in all fields of study to enable the educational facilities to support students and teachers as they prepare for and enter the 21st century.

8C The Interagency Committee, the Maryland State Department of Education, and local boards of education should work together during the developmental stage of educational program changes and new educational initiatives to determine the facility implications.

8D The Interagency Committee should work closely with the Information Technology Board to investigate the facility implications for public schools and support the State policies, recommendations, and initiatives in this area.

9. Review the level of funding that should be recommended for the State Public School Construction Program.

9A Bearing in mind capital debt affordability and the availability of general funds, the Governor and the Maryland General Assembly should consider increasing the funding level to meet public school construction needs when (a) adjustments for inflation are warranted, (b) improvements in the economy provide surplus funds, and/or (c) there is growth in the overall State debt affordability limits.

9B The State Public School Construction Program should be funded at a level of at least $85 million in FY'95 and phased in to a level of at least $100 million annually over the next five years.

9C The funding authorized should be a combination of new bond authorizations, general funds ("pay-go") and recycled public school construction funds.

Introduction

Governor William Donald Schaefer on October 7, 1992 signed Executive Order 01.01.1992.21 which established the Governor's Task Force on School Construction (see Appendix A). The Executive Order was signed in recognition of the following facts:

(a) Public school enrollment is projected to increase from 720,000 students in 1991 to 855,000 by the year 2001, an increase of approximately 19%, which will require many new schools and/or additions to existing schools throughout the State;

(b) There are over 106 million square feet of space in the State's public school buildings. Approximately 20 million square were constructed prior to 1960 and represent a significant portion of the aging educational infrastructure; and

(c) The General Assembly has recognized these conditions and needs, as evidenced by the passage of Joint Resolution 6 of 1992;

Eight (8) specific subjects were identified by the Governor for study and review. Each of these were reviewed separately by the Task Force in briefing sessions and subsequent discussions.

The Task Force had twenty-one (21) members with representatives from the Maryland General Assembly; State government; local government; local boards of education; and private citizens familiar with public education, the construction industry, and financial matters. They represented all parts of the State, small and large school systems, rich and poor subdivisions, and growth and non-growth areas.

On May 21, 1993 Governor Schaefer, in response to a request from Mr. Sidney Kramer, chairperson of the Task Force, signed Executive Order 01.01.1993.14 which provided a one month extension (to July 31, 1993) for the submission of the report of the Task Force. The extension was necessary to obtain public comments, reactions, and responses to the preliminary recommendations developed by the Task Force.

Task Force Activities

The Task Force held ten meetings between October 1992 and July 1993. Six of these meetings were held in various parts of the State to enable representatives of local school systems, local governments, educational associations and organizations,and other interested parties to present concerns, ideas, suggestions, and proposals to the members of the Task Force. The Task Force met at the following locations for this purpose:

November 12, 1992	- Charles County
December 17, 1992	- Baltimore City
January 21, 1993	- Queen Anne's County
February 18, 1993	- Anne Arundel County
April 22, 1993	- Prince George's County
May 13, 1993	- Washington County

The Task Force met in open session at each location. The first two hours were devoted to briefings from staff and invited speakers. The second half of the meetings allowed time for other individuals representing local boards of education, local governments, or other interested parties to present oral and/or written testimony to the Task Force. Over sixty individuals availed themselves of this opportunity with at least one presentation from each of the 24 subdivisions. Several representatives from statewide associations and organizations made presentations.

On June 3, 1993 the Task Force met to review a draft of the recommendations prepared by the staff based upon the Findings and Facts that had been identified by the Task Force at their previous meeting (May 13, 1993). These recommendations were reviewed, discussed and revised to reflect the decisions of the Task Force and represent their preliminary recommendations.

The Preliminary Recommendations of the Governor's Task Force on School Construction (6/3/93) were distributed to over 150 individuals in local boards of education, local governments, State government, associations, and organizations, and to other interested parties. They were informed that a public hearing would be held by the Task Force on June 24, 1993 in Annapolis to present comments, reactions, and/or suggestions in response to the preliminary recommendations.

The public hearing was held on June 24, 1993 at which time ten (10) individuals provided oral and/or written comments, reactions, and suggestions. Following the testimony the Task Force reviewed the preliminary recommendations, made revisions, and added two additional recommendations (the new 1C and 3C). A draft of the report was provided to each Task Force member and it, along with the latest revisions to the preliminary recommendations, were scheduled for review at the next meeting.

The final meeting of the Task Force was held on July 15, 1993. The purpose of the meeting was to finalize and approve the revised draft Report of the Governor's Task Force on School

Construction. Prior to initiating this activity copies of the written comments which were received after the last meeting were distributed to the members of the Task Force. The Task Force reviewed the revised draft of the report, including the findings and facts, and the recommendations along with additional written testimony that had been submitted since the last meeting. The report was reviewed page by page.

The Task Force members discussed the State/local shared cost formula and the current policy which provides 50% - 75% State funding for public school construction projects. They recognized, however, that the three year average of the State Share Percentage of Basic Current Expenses for Somerset County exceeds 75%. They, therefore, recommended that Somerset County's percentage be increased to 80% as a warranted exception to the current policy. Appropriate changes and footnotes to recommendation 2A would be amended in the report.

The report of the Governor's Task Force on School Construction was unanimously accepted as amended.

The Chairperson directed the staff to prepare the final report for presentation to the Governor and for distribution throughout the State to local boards of education, local governments, and other interested parties.

The Public School Construction Program

The Interagency Committee on School Construction was established by the Board of Public Works in 1971 to administer the State of Maryland's Public School Construction Program. The Interagency Committee operates under the provisions of the Education Article (5-301, 302, 303, 307, and 308) and the Rules, Regulations and Procedures for the Administration of the School Construction Program which are approved and amended by the Board of Public Works.

The program was established to provide State funding for eligible and justified public school construction projects that were approved by the Board of Public Works. The purpose was to:

(a) provide local property tax relief;

(b) relieve the subdivisions of the high costs of school construction;

(c) address the considerable backlog of new construction, renovation, and replacement of schools;

(d) even out the financial impact through the State assumption of these costs; and

(e) equalize educational facilities and opportunities throughout the State.

Since the Program's inception in 1971 the State has approved over $2 billion for school construction projects in the 24 school systems throughout the State. The State, in 1971, also assumed $755 million of local county debt for school construction projects that were constructed prior to June 30, 1967.

The Interagency Committee on School Construction, in carrying out its responsibilities, requires the submission of three important planning documents for each school system on an annual basis:

(a) Educational Facilities Master Plan;

(b) Annual and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program; and

(c) Comprehensive Maintenance Plan

The Interagency Committee and its staff (from 4 State agencies) is responsible for the many activities related to the approval, planning, design, construction, and funding of public schools in Maryland. The activities include the following:

(a) review of project justification (scope and capacity);

(b) establish project budgets and subsequent allocations;

(c) review and approval or comment on the various architectural design phases;

(d) approval of the award of construction contracts;

(e) review of change orders;

(f) process monthly financial reports;

(g) authorize cash advances and payments;

(h) conduct field audits;

(i) conduct maintenance surveys;

(j) approve the acquisition of new school sites;

(k) approve the disposition of surplus schools and/or sites; and

(l) provide technical assistance.

The Public School Construction Program operates under the Rules, Regulations, and Procedures for the Administration of the School Construction Program. (R,R,& P). During the 22-year life of the Program there have been several task forces and/or committees appointed to examine the Public School Construction Program. The recommendations of these task forces were reviewed and studied by the Board of Public Works. Subsequently, revisions were made to the R,R,& P with input and responses from

local boards of education, local government officials, legislative committees, and other interested parties. The current R.R.& P (dated October 11, 1989) are provided in Appendix B.

Information Presented

The Task Force heard presentations on a wide range of subjects related to the planning, design, construction, financing, management, operation, and maintenance of public schools. Presentations were made by the staff based upon research, data collection, and/or review and analysis of existing information. The staff arranged for other presentations from individuals with expertise on the subjects being considered.

Written and/or oral testimony was presented by over 60 individuals during the public hearing portion of the Task Force meetings. Many of their concerns and suggestions were considered by the Task Force and formed the basis of the Task Force recommendations.

Several excerpts from the materials presented to the Task Force can be found in the Appendices. These documents reflect the diverse nature of the subject matter reviewed and they are directly related to the Findings and Facts and the Task Force Recommendations.

Options and Conclusions

The major issues that the Task Force was directed to consider were (1) the role and responsibility of the State for funding public school construction and capital improvements; (2) if there is a State responsibility, what level of funding should be provided; and (3) how should the Program be modified and/or revised to best serve the children and citizens of the State.

The Task Force endorses the continuation of the Public School Construction Program based upon the initial objectives. They recommend that a significant additional objective be added which is to encourage and support other State policies and initiatives. These initiatives should include but are not limited to the following:

(a) educational programs and services
(b) employment and training
(c) energy conservation
(d) growth management

The options for the role of the State in the Public School Construction Program and funding levels which were considered by the staff and presented to the Task Force are identified below.

There are four (4) major categories with a total of ten (10) basic options.

Options

1 I Abolish the State Public School Construction Program

II Decrease the level of State-wide funding

2 (a) Maintain existing State/local shared cost formula (50-75%)
3 (b) Decrease the State share for each project
4 (c) Increase the State share for each project

III Maintain existing level of State-wide funding ($60 million)

5 (a) Maintain existing State/local shared cost formula (50-75%)
6 (b) Decrease the State share for each project
7 (c) Increase the State share for each project

IV Increase the level of State-wide funding

8 (a) Maintain existing State/local shared cost formula (50-75%)
9 (b) Decrease the State share for each project
10 (c) Increase the State share for each project

The Task Force believes that option 8(a) best reflects their position based upon their study and review of the material and information that was presented to them. This position is evidenced by the specific language and text in the Findings and Facts with Recommendations section that follows.

Findings and Facts with Recommendations

The thirty-nine (39) recommendations which follow recognize a State role and responsibility for funding public school construction projects to address the requirements and needs of children and citizens of Maryland. The Task Force Findings and Facts with their Recommendations are presented under each of the eight (8) areas identified for study in the Governor's Executive Order which established the Task Force. A ninth item was added pertaining to a recommended level of State funding.

The funding for public school construction projects, whether for new schools, additions, and/or renovations can only be accomplished with cooperative efforts among the State, local governments, and local boards of education. The children of this state and its citizens benefit and prosper through these collaborative efforts.

1. Examine the identified project requests from the 24 local educational agencies and evaluate their requirements for the first 5 years and the 10-year period through the year 2001. This would include requests for new schools, renovations, additions, and systemic renovations (roofs, boilers, etc.). This review should include a study of former public school facilities that had been closed which would be reopened to serve increasing enrollments.

Findings and Facts:

- Public school enrollments (K-12) are projected to increase by 155,000 students between 1991 and the year 2001. New schools and/or additions have been requested by most school systems to accommodate these students.

- Existing space in the State's public schools is aging. Currently there is approximately 110 million square feet of space. Over 17 million square feet (16%) were built or renovated prior to 1960 and are now at least 30 years of age. By the year 2000 there will be approximately 50 million square feet of space built prior to 1970 that will be over 30 years old. Many of these buildings will need major renovations to meet current and anticipated educational requirements.

- Existing building systems - roofs, boilers, chillers, mechanical systems, electrical systems, etc. are continuing to age and will need replacement.

- A review of the annual and five-year capital improvement program for FY'94-FY'99 (after subtracting the projects funded in the FY'94 CIP $87 million) yields the following:

"A" projects - expected proceed	$460 million
"B" projects - questions, existing or potential	$189 million
"C" projects - should not proceed	$121 million

- The increased utilization of public school buildings through the implementation of year-round-school programs (i.e., 45-15) can eliminate and/or reduce construction costs. Several factors that should be studied prior to implementation include - program offerings, scheduling of students, community acceptance, air conditioning of schools, cost benefit analysis, alternative time for teacher training, programs and activities for students when not in school, and child care arrangements.

- There are existing public schools that were closed and/or declared surplus during the decline in enrollments in the 1970's and 80's which may be available for reacquisition or reopening as a public school.

Recommendations:

1A The Maryland State Board of Education has established performance standards for all public schools. The Interagency Committee should encourage the planning and funding of projects that enhance and support the implementation of these standards.

1B The Interagency Committee should require each school system to study former school buildings that have been closed due to declining enrollments for their potential reuse as a public school building. This would include former public school buildings that are used for other educational purposes by the board of education and former public school buildings that have been transferred to the local government. In the case of buildings transferred to local government, this analysis shall include the fiscal and public service impacts of reuse for public schools, as determined by the local governments and the school board.

1C The Interagency Committee should require each school system to review for closure, consolidation or redistricting any school which operates at less than 60% of the rated capacity for more than 2 consecutive school years.

1D The Interagency Committee should increase the eligible square footage in the Capacity and Space Formula for elementary schools by 5% to provide additional space now required for expanded educational programs and services that were not provided in 1976 when the existing formula was established. It is further recommended that the Interagency Committee should study the square footage requirements for middle schools and high schools.

1E The Interagency Committee should establish a new priority category which specifically encourages and supports local school systems to implement State and local educational initiatives through the submission of smaller renovation or addition projects. This would be a new priority #4 for educational initiatives such as: pre-kindergarten, science, technology education, and Maryland School Performance Program projects in "special assistance" schools.

1F The Interagency Committee should develop incentives for any school system and county government that jointly adopt a long-term commitment to a year-round school schedule (180 days) or any other scheduling method that enhances educational objectives and decreases the need for additional educational facilities.

1G The Interagency Committee should continue its activities and work closely with the Department of General Services, local boards of education, and county governments to develop cost savings techniques and procedures to more efficiently utilize the State and local funds committed to public school construction projects. This includes clearinghouse functions pertaining to the selection of materials, design and construction techniques, contract administration, and preparation of bid documents. Discussions and workshops with architects, engineers, contractors, subcontractors, and school system facility planners to improve the planning, design, and construction process should continue on a regular basis.

1H The Interagency Committee should encourage local education agencies and county governments to utilize value engineering and/or construction management to assure that projects are designed and constructed economically without sacrificing functions and capabilities. The Interagency Committee should participate in these costs. Furthermore, they should develop materials and information which describes the process; suggest criteria for the selection of value engineering consultants; suggest methods of implementation; act as a clearinghouse to shareproposals from value engineering consultants and the project architect's response; and identify cost effective and efficient design and construction techniques, supplies, materials, and equipment.

1I The Interagency Committee should have legislation introduced to delete Section 5-308 Asbestos Removal Fund from the Education Article. The program has not been funded or implemented since passage in 1985.

1J The Interagency Committee should continue to review projects for eligibility based upon projected enrollments. This review includes a study of adjacent schools to assure full utilization of all facilities.

1K The Interagency Committee and the Maryland Office of Planning should serve as a resource for local governments interested in (a) developing Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances to monitor, direct, and control growth; and (b) Impact Fees to provide funding for capital projects required to meet growth and development.

1L The Interagency Committee should continue to fund modular construction projects and enable local boards of education to utilize State owned relocatable classroom buildings.

2. Review and examine funding sources and the State/local shared cost formula which was established in 1987. Consider alternative methods of funding or a formula which takes into consideration the financial condition and ability of State and local governments.

Findings and Facts:

- The State/local shared cost formula adopted by the Board of Public Works in 1987 utilizes the Basic Current Expense education aid formula. State funding varies from 50 percent (for the wealthiest school systems) to 75 percent (for the poorer school systems).
- The formula attempts to equalize with 50 percent as the base.
- The relative wealth of several jurisdictions has changed since the State/local shared cost formula was adopted in 1987.
- State General Obligation Bonds are the source of funding for public school construction projects. State funding for school construction comes within the total annual capital State debt affordability.
- Local governments have been assuming a greater portion of school construction costs since the mid-1970's.
- The Board of Public Works modified the Rules, Regulations, and Procedures to enable State funding for lease-lease back public school construction projects.

Recommendations:

2A The Board of Public Works should revise the State/local shared cost formula to provide seven funding levels between 50% - 75% with 80% as an exception for Somerset County, the only jurisdiction above 75% (50, 55, 60, 65, 70, 75, 80). These figures are based upon the three year average of State funding for Aid to Education - Basic Current Expenses for FY'92-FY'94. The new levels should be utilized for Public School Construction Program funding for FY'95-FY'99 and appropriate adjustments made for all school systems. (See the following chart.)

2B The Interagency Committee should establish a new priority category for systemic renovation projects. This should be a new priority #5. State funding for

systemic renovation projects should be based upon the State/local shared cost formula (equalization factor) rather than the current funding method (percentage) which is related to the age of the system or component being replaced.

2C The Interagency Committee should continue to provide funding for appropriately financed lease-lease back projects and work with local education agencies and local governments to explore and implement other innovative funding techniques.

Chart for Recommendation 2A

STATE/LOCAL SHARED COST FORMULA (1)

	Existing	Proposed	
Allegany County	65	75	
Anne Arundel County	55	50	
Baltimore City	75	75	
Baltimore County	50	50	
Calvert County	50	55	
Caroline County	75	75	
Carroll County	65	65	
Cecil County	75	70	
Charles County	65	65	
Dorchester County	65	70	
Frederick County	65	65	
Garrett County	75	70	
Harford County	65	65	
Howard County	50	50	
Kent County	55	50	
Montgomery County	50	50	
Prince George's County	55	60	
Queen Anne's County	55	55	
St. Mary's County	65	70	
Somerset County	75	80	(2)
Talbot County	50	50	
Washington County	65	65	
Wicomico County	65	70	
Worcester County	50	50	

(1) percent State share

(2) This is an exception to the current policy of 50% - 75% State funding for public school construction projects. The three year average of the State Share Percentage of Basic Current Expenses for Somerset County exceeds 75%, and an increase to the next increment is warranted.

3. Investigate alternatives which could provide State reimbursement for eligible projects that have been forward funded by local governments. Currently, these projects must be reimbursed from operating budget funds (pay-go).

Findings and Facts:

- There are seven (7) forward funded projects in five (5) school systems that total approximately $16 million which were previously approved for planning by the Board of Public Works.
- There are approximately $51,318,000 worth of forward funded projects which meet eligibility requirements which were deferred due to fiscal constraints. An additional $25,015,000 in projects are anticipated to be eligible for funding in a future fiscal year as enrollments increase.
- Some counties may continue to forward fund projects.
- State General Obligation Bonds cannot be utilized to reimburse a local board of education for forward funded projects that have been constructed and occupied.
- Pay-go funds in the operating budget for capital projects could be used for the reimbursement of forward funded projects.

Recommendations:

3A As general funds ("pay-go") become available, the Board of Public Works and the Maryland General Assembly should approve State funding to reimburse the five (5) jurisdictions for the seven (7) forward funded projects which were previously approved for planning by the Board of Public Works and then for those projects which were deferred because of fiscal constraints and were, therefore, not approved for planning.

3B The Interagency Committee with assistance from the Comptroller and the Treasurer should continue to investigate State funding options for reimbursement for forward funded projects that are undertaken in the future within the limitations imposed by Federal laws, rules, and/or regulations.

3C The Interagency Committee should encourage the Maryland General Assembly to adopt legislation which would enable any jurisdiction to undertake interim debt financing for State approved forward funded projects for which State funding may be temporarily unavailable because of State fiscal constraints.

4. Review the formula for calculating the State Rated Capacity (SRC) for elementary schools. The SRC is utilized by the Public School Construction Program (PSCP) to determine the eligibility of projects and the justification for State funding. Any recommended changes should consider the educational and fiscal impact.

Findings and Facts:

- The existing SRC for elementary schools is:
  Kindergarten : 25
  Grades 1-5/6 : 30

- The State Rated Capacity (SRC) for elementary schools does not reflect the current class size practices in Maryland public elementary schools.

- A review of the data gathered pertaining to current class size is as follows:

  Kindergarten:
  19 school systems have an average class size of 22 or less

  Grades 1-5/6
  22 school systems have an average class size of 25 or less

- Reducing the SRC for kindergarten to 22 and grades 1-5/6 to 25 would shift 17 projects that total $43 million from categories "B" or "C" to the "A" category.

- Reducing the SRC will result in requests for projects with larger capacities. Projects not previously requested by the local education agency may now be requested and justified.

Recommendation:

4A The Interagency Committee should revise the State Rated Capacity (SRC) for elementary schools to more closely reflect actual staffing and class size at the elementary school level. Revise kindergarten from 25 to 22 and grades 1-5/6 from 30 to 25.

5. Review State policies and procedures that pertain to the funding of pre-kindergarten classes, and the educational facilities that are or should be provided. Any recommended changes should consider the educational and fiscal impact.

Findings and Facts:

- The pre-kindergarten program is a State initiative that began several years ago.
- State funds have not been provided for capital projects for pre-K students.
- There are approximately 12,000 pre-K students in 23 school systems and an additional 15,000 students could be phased-in over the next few years.
- State funding for facilities for 12,000 pre-K students would range from $17 million to $28 million (additions vs. new schools).

Recommendation:

5A The Interagency Committee with the approval of the Board of Public Works should revise the Capacity and Space Formula to provide space for pre-kindergarten students in support of the State policy to provide funding for pre-kindergarten classes and programs. The formula should be adjusted to add the following for each space based upon full-time equivalent enrollment:

Pre-Kindergarten : 20

6. Review the policies, practices and/or procedures that are utilized by PSCP to assure that all projects comply with State and local growth management plans and policies.

Findings and Facts:

- The Public School Construction Program has policies and procedures in place for reviewing and approving projects to determine if they are consistent with State and local growth management plans and policies.
- Educational Facility Master Plans, prepared and submitted by local education agencies, are required to be consistent with State and local growth management plans and policies.

- The Public School Construction Program has policies and procedures in place for reviewing new sites for public schools to determine if the sites are consistent with State and local growth management plans and policies.

- The current policies, practices, and procedures of the Public School Construction Program support and encourage energy conservation in State funded public school projects.

- The Public School Construction Program has and continues to develop interagency cooperation and coordination of reviews and applications by other State agencies.

Recommendations:

6A The Interagency Committee should require local boards of education to address the adopted Comprehensive Plan of the local jurisdiction in the Educational Facility Master Plan which is submitted annually.

6B The Interagency Committee should require that the local government body as certified by the planning board, commission, or director, as appropriate, provide a written statement as part of the Educational Facility Master Plan which states that the plan is consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan of the local jurisdiction.

6C Existing public school buildings should be renovated whenever possible and economical to (a) retain the school building within the neighborhood or community and (b) preserve and enhance prior State and/or local investments. If the Interagency Committee and Board of Public Works determine that a school should be renovated rather than replaced and the local board of education and local government decide to proceed with a replacement school, then the project would not be eligible for State funding in excess of the projected cost of the renovation project.

6D The Interagency Committee should continue to work closely with the Maryland Office of Planning and the Interagency Economic Growth, Resource Protection, and Planning Committee in the review of the local board of education's selection of school sites, project approval, and site development requirements.

6E The Interagency Committee should continue to work with the Department of General Services, the Maryland State Department of Education, and local boards of education to plan, design, construct, and operate energy efficient public school buildings.

7. Review the policies, practices and/or procedures that are utilized by PSCP to assure that existing public school buildings are properly maintained by the public school systems and local fiscal authorities.

Findings and Facts:

- The Public School Construction Program requires the annual submittal of a Comprehensive Maintenance Plan or update from each local education agency.
- The Public School Construction Program requires the annual submittal of financial data for maintenance expenditures.
- The Public School Construction Program conducts a maintenance inspection of a sampling of public schools in all school systems throughout the State each year.
- Since 1986 the Public School Construction Program has provided funding for systemic renovation projects which replace (through capital improvements) building systems that have outlived their useful life.
- Some school systems with smaller school buildings are unable to qualify for a systemic renovation project since the estimated cost for the work would not exceed $100,000, the minimum level for qualification.

Recommendations:

7A The Interagency Committee should continue to require the submission of a Comprehensive Maintenance Plan with annual updates from local boards of education.

7B The Interagency Committee should continue to collect, review, and analyze financial expenditure data for maintenance from the local boards of education. Any concerns or problems should be reported to the Board of Public Works and local government.

7C The Interagency Committee should continue to inspect selected public schools each year and report their findings to local boards of education and local governments. The Interagency Committee should continue to require that appropriate corrective action be taken.

7D The maintenance of public schools is a local responsibility. State funding for systemic renovation projects should only be provided for critical projects which will extend the useful life of the facility.

7E The Interagency Committee should provide funding for small systemic renovation projects costing less than $100,000 but more than $50,000. This would enable subdivisions with smaller existing schools to apply for systemic renovation funding. The same criteria and funding formula would apply. This fund source would only be available for a jurisdiction that did not have any requests for projects exceeding $100,000 in estimated costs. The total amount to be allocated for this purpose in any given year would not exceed $500,000.

7F The Interagency Committee and the Board of Public Works should continue to have the authority to withhold State school construction funds if a specific building or group of buildings are not properly maintained. This action would be taken after the local board of education and local government have been notified.

7G The Interagency Committee should continue to serve as a resource for local education agencies providing training and disseminating information that would be beneficial to the local education agencies.

8. Review the policies, practices and/or procedures that are utilized by the PSCP to assure that the facilities being designed and constructed for such programs as science, mathematics, career and technology education, special education, and the inclusion of instructional technology in the public schools will meet the needs of students, educators and the business community into the 21st century.

Findings and Facts:

- The Public School Construction Program works closely with the Maryland State Department of Education and local education agencies to obtain information and support the design and construction of public schools that will meet current and projected requirements for educational programs and services.

- The Public School Construction Program encourages and supports a participatory planning process for each project which includes representatives from the business, industrial, scientific and technological community.

- The Public School Construction Program encourages the design of public school buildings which support their shared use and/or extended use with other governmental, community, and business entities.

Recommendations:

8A The Interagency Committee should continue to keep abreast of current educational programs and technology changes which would impact on the planning, design, and construction of public school buildings. The IAC should disseminate appropriate information to the local education agencies.

8B The Interagency Committee should continue to work closely with the Maryland State Department of Education, local educators, and the business community to review and analyze proposed changes in all fields of study to enable the educational facilities to support students and teachers as they prepare for and enter the 21st century.

8C The Interagency Committee, the Maryland State Department of Education, and local boards of education should work together during the developmental stage of educational program changes and new educational initiatives to determine the facility implications.

8D The Interagency Committee should work closely with the Information Technology Board to investigate the facility implications for public schools and support the State policies, recommendations, and initiatives in this area.

9. Review the level of funding that should be recommended for the State Public School Construction Program.

Findings and Facts:

- State funding for public school construction projects is competing with a wide variety of State and local projects for limited State capital funding.
- Approximately 60 percent of all funds authorized by the Maryland General Assembly for capital projects during the past twenty-two years were for non-State owned facilities.
- Of all the funds authorized for non-State owned facilities, half (30 percent) went to local boards of education for public school construction projects. This figure is $2 billion and does not include interest payments to repay the General Obligation Bonds.
- The State, in 1971, assumed $755 million of outstanding local bond debt for public schools constructed prior to June 30, 1967. This debt is almost completely retired ($5 million outstanding - principal and interest) with a final payment due in 1998.

- A review of the annual and five-year capital improvement program for FY'94-'99 indicates there are $460 million in "A" projects (expected to proceed). Lowering the State rated capacity formula for elementary schools shifts $43 million of "B" and "C" projects to the "A" category. The funding of pre-kindergarten space would add approximately $45 million for projects to accommodate 24,000-27,000 students.

Recommendations:

9A Bearing in mind capital debt affordability and the availability of general funds, the Governor and the Maryland General Assembly should consider increasing the funding level to meet public school construction needs when (a) adjustments for inflation are warranted, (b) improvements in the economy provide surplus funds, and/or (c) there is growth in the overall State debt affordability limits.

9B The State Public School Construction Program should be funded at a level of at least $85 million in FY'95 and phased in to a level of at least $100 million annually over the next five years.

9C The funding authorized should be a combination of new bond authorizations, general funds ("pay-go") and recycled public school construction funds.

Concluding Statements

The members of the Task Force believe that the recommendations presented above have had wide distribution in their preliminary form with limited comments for changes or major revisions. In fact there is broad based support for them. Their acceptance and implementation should therefore proceed as soon as possible.

The Task Force encourages implementation of these recommendations to be applied to new projects which will be submitted in the FY'95 Public School Construction Capital Improvement Program. Projects with prior planning approval should continue to be funded under the current formula.

The members of the Task Force are prepared to assist in the activities required to implement any and all of the recommendations.

As plans are developed to implement these recommendations, consideration should be given to the impact on staffing and the operational budget requirements of each agency that supports the Public School Construction Program.

The Task Force acknowledges and expresses its appreciation to the staff of the Task Force and assistance provided by the staff of the Interagency Committee on School Construction and the Department of Fiscal Services. They worked diligently to assist the members of the Task Force in the fulfillment of their responsibilities. They provided the necessary support for the Task Force to function efficiently and effectively.

APPENDICES

		Page
A -	Executive Order 01.01.1992.21	A-1
B -	Rules, Regulations, and Procedures for the Administration of the School Construction Program	B-1
C -	Public School Construction in Maryland: Historical Background	C-1
D -	Cost and Impact of the School Construction Program 1971-1993	D-1
E -	Public School Enrollments 1981-2001	E-1
F -	Maryland Public Schools Facilities Inventory	F-1
G -	Maryland Public School Construction Program Summary of CIP Requests FY'94-FY'99	G-1
H -	Public School Enrollments and Capacities	H-1
I -	Summary of Outstanding LEA Construction Requests FY'94-FY'99	I-1
J -	Forward Funded Projects	J-1
K -	Pupil Teacher Ratios: Elementary Schools	K-1
L -	Pre-Kindergarten Education	L-1
M -	State/Local Shared Cost Formula	M-1

The State of Maryland
Executive Department

EXECUTIVE ORDER
01.01.1992.21

Governor's Task Force on School Construction

WHEREAS, The State of Maryland established the State Public School Construction Program in 1971 to provide financial assistance to local boards of education for the construction and renovation of public school buildings;

WHEREAS, The State of Maryland has provided in excess of $1.9 billion for this purpose;

WHEREAS, The State of Maryland has also relieved local jurisdictions of $750 million in fiscal obligations for schools constructed prior to June 30, 1967;

WHEREAS, The public school enrollment is projected to increase from 720,000 students in 1991 to 855,000 by the year 2001, an increase of approximately 19%, which will require many new schools and/or additions to existing schools throughout the State;

WHEREAS, There are over 106 million square feet of space in the State's public school buildings, and approximately 20 million square feet were constructed prior to 1960 and represent a significant portion of the aging educational infrastructure;

WHEREAS, Identified and projected educational facility needs will exceed the anticipated State and local funding under the current formula, which was adopted by the Board of Public Works in 1987; and

WHEREAS, The General Assembly has recognized these conditions and needs, as evidenced by the passage of Joint Resolution 6 of 1992;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, WILLIAM DONALD SCHAEFER, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND, BY VIRTUE OF THE AUTHORITY VESTED IN ME BY THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS OF MARYLAND, HEREBY PROCLAIM THE FOLLOWING EXECUTIVE ORDER, EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY:

A. There is a Governor's Task Force on School Construction.

B. Membership and Procedures of the Governor's Task Force on School Construction.

(1) The Task Force shall consist of 21 members appointed by the Governor, with representation from every region of the State, and shall include:

(a) 2 members of the Senate of Maryland, nominated by the President of the Senate;

(b) 2 members of the House of Delegates, nominated by the Speaker of the House;

(c) The State Treasurer;

(d) The State Superintendent of Schools;

(e) The Director of the Maryland Office of Planning;

(f) The Secretary of General Services;

(g) 3 local school superintendents or local board of education representatives;

(h) 4 representatives of local governments or individuals familiar with local government operations and procedures; and

(i) 6 members from the public at large including individuals familiar with the construction industry or State and local financial matters.

(2) The Governor shall appoint the Chairperson from the members of the Task Force.

(3) The Governor may remove any member of the Task Force for any cause adversely affecting the member's ability or willingness to perform his or her duties.

(4) In the event of a vacancy on the Task Force, the Governor shall appoint a successor.

(5) A majority of the Task Force shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of any business. The Task Force may

adopt such other procedures necessary to ensure the orderly transaction of business.

(6) The Chairperson may appoint subcommittees as necessary to study specific issues of the Task Force.

(7) The members of the Task Force may not receive compensation for their services, but may receive reimbursement for the expenses related to these duties and activities.

(8) Staff support to the Task Force shall be provided by the Public School Construction Program and other agencies as is appropriate and necessary.

C. Scope of the Task Force. The Task Force shall conduct an in-depth study and review of the Public School Construction Program and present recommendations to the Governor. In carrying out this charge, the Task force shall:

(1) Examine the identified project requests from the 24 local educational agencies and evaluate their requirements for the next five- and ten-year periods, including requests for new schools, renovations, additions, and systemic renovations. Their review should include a study of former public schools that have been closed and that could be reopened to serve increasing enrollments.

(2) Review and examine funding sources and the State/local shared cost formula that was established in 1987, and consider alternative methods of funding for a formula which takes into consideration the financial condition and ability of State and local governments.

(3) Investigate alternatives that could provide State reimbursement for eligible projects that have been forward-funded by local governments, which projects currently must be reimbursed from operational budget funds (pay-go).

(4) Review the formula for calculating the State Rated Capacity (SRC) for elementary schools, taking into consideration the educational and fiscal impact of any recommended changes.

(5) Review State policies and/or procedures that pertain to the funding of pre-kindergarten classes and the educational facilities that are or should be provided, taking into consideration the educational and fiscal impact of any recommended changes.

(6) Review the policies, practices, and/or procedures that are utilized by the Public School Construction Program to assure that all projects comply with State and local growth management plans and policies.

(7) Review the policies, practices, and/or procedures that are utilized by the Public School Construction Program to assure that existing public school buildings are properly maintained by the public school systems and local fiscal authorities.

(8) Review the policies, practices, and/or procedures that are utilized by the Public School Construction Program to assure that the facilities being designed and constructed for such programs as science, mathematics, career and technology education, special education, and the inclusion of instructional technology in the public schools will meet the needs of students, educators, and the business community into the 21st century.

D. The Task Force shall provide a final report containing its findings and recommendations to the Governor by June 30, 1993. Unless amended, extended, or terminated earlier, this Executive Order shall expire on that date.

GIVEN Under My Hand and the Great Seal of the State of Maryland, in the City of Annapolis, this 7th day of October, 1992.

William Donald Schaefer
Governor

ATTEST:

Winfield M. Kelly
Secretary of State

APPENDIX B

RULES, REGULATIONS, AND PROCEDURES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

(Accepted & Approved: June 10, 1981 - Board of Public Works)
(Amended: September 21, 1982, September 17, 1986,
December 30, 1987 and October 11, 1989)

1. INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

There shall be an Interagency Committee on School Construction (hereafter referred to as the Committee), which shall consist of the Director of the Maryland Office of Planning, the Secretary of General Services, and the State Superintendent of Schools, or their respective designees. The State Superintendent of Schools or the Superintendent's designee shall chair the Committee. The Committee shall be responsible for the appointment of an Executive Director with the approval of the Board of Public Works. All decisions of the Committee are to be by majority vote except as provided in Section 4 below. The Committee shall assemble, amend, and keep up to date an annual and a five-year program of elementary and secondary school capital improvements funded or to be funded by the State, including remodeling of school facilities as defined herein. The annual program shall contain the maximum state participation in the cost of each project.

2. DEFINITION

Wherever in these regulations the term "local boards" is used, such term shall be construed to refer to the Boards of Education of the several counties and Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore City except that where the charter, local law, or ordinance of Baltimore City allocates any function to the Board of Estimates or the Mayor and City Council, the term "local board" when used in connection with such function shall be construed to refer to the appropriate authority. However, all prerogatives allowed to the Committee for prior review and approval as prescribed and required herein shall not be abrogated on account of the title of school property and the improvements thereon being in the name of the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore.

3. EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

(a) As a condition of the receipt of state project approval and/or school construction funds, each local board of education shall prepare, submit, and annually amend its school system's educational facilities master plan.

(b) The master plan and amendments thereto shall be reviewed by the Committee as to format, content, and completeness as described in the Public School Construction Program Administrative Procedures Guide.

(c) The Committee will notify the LEA in writing of its comments noting any objections or exceptions it has to the educational facilities master plan. This planning document together with its annual amendments submitted by the LEA and the aforementioned Committee comments becomes the plan of record.

(d) The annual and subsequent five-year capital improvement program submitted by each local board of education shall be consistent with the current educational facilities master plan of record. The Committee may recommend to the Board of Public Works the disapproval of any school construction project that is not consistent with the current master plan of record.

4. STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Prior to September 15 of each year, the Committee shall inform each local board of the amount of estimated capital funds available for the upcoming fiscal year. Each local board shall submit to the Committee by December 7 of each year its updated and detailed capital improvement program for the following fiscal year, to be accompanied by a school capital improvement program for the ensuing five years, both of which shall have been approved by the appropriate local governing bodies. The Committee shall recommend approval or, in consultation with affected local boards, modification of the capital improvement programs, and forward a consolidated State program for the following fiscal year to the Board of Public Works to be acted on at the Board's January meeting. In the event the Committee is unable to reach unanimous agreement on any aspect of the consolidated program, the final recommendation to the Board of Public Works shall be as determined by the Governor. Amendments to the consolidated State program which a local board deems it necessary to submit during the course of the year shall also be subject to approval by the Committee and the Board of Public Works.

5. MAXIMUM STATE PROJECT ALLOCATION

The Committee shall establish a maximum State construction allocation which is the maximum State participation for each project when it is being considered for inclusion in an annual capital improvement program for construction funding as follows:

(a) The maximum State construction allocation shall be based on the product of the latest adjusted average statewide per square foot cost of construction for schools in Maryland and the approved area allowances for the project as limited by the PSCP capacity and space formula and these rules and regulations.

(b) The average per square foot cost of school construction based on the best cost experience of schools constructed in the prior year(s) shall be published by the Committee at least annually. The per square foot construction cost shall include site work, and the per square foot building cost shall exclude site work.

(c) The maximum State construction allocation shall also include adjustments for inflation to time of bid, regional cost differences, and a percentage for contingency as determined by the Committee.

(d) The maximum State construction allocation shall be adjusted to reflect the State and local sharing of this expenditure for all projects approved for local planning on or after February 11, 1987. The State share, which represents the maximum State construction allocation for the eligible portion of a construction contract is computed by applying the following percentages to the factors cited in sections (a), (b) and (c) above:

Allegany County	- 65 percent	Harford County	- 65 percent
Anne Arundel County	- 55 percent	Howard County	- 50 percent
Baltimore City	- 75 percent	Kent County	- 55 percent
Baltimore County	- 50 percent	Montgomery County	- 50 percent
Calvert County	- 50 percent	Prince George's County	- 55 percent
Caroline County	- 75 percent	Queen Anne's County	- 55 percent
Carroll County	- 65 percent	St. Mary's County	- 65 percent
Cecil County	- 75 percent	Somerset County	- 75 percent
Charles County	- 65 percent	Talbot County	- 50 percent
Dorchester County	- 65 percent	Washington County	- 65 percent
Frederick County	- 65 percent	Wicomico County	- 65 percent
Garrett County	- 75 percent	Worcester County	- 50 percent

(e) The maximum State allocation for a project shall be reviewed before the Committee and the Board of Public Works prior to approving the capital improvement program. Once the allocation is established as prescribed herein and included in an annual capital improvement program and approved by the Board of Public Works, it cannot be increased and shall not be subject to appeal, Section 10 notwithstanding.

6. ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES

State participation in the contract costs of the following types of capital improvements shall be eligible if approved in accordance with these regulations:

(a) For a new school, first-time site development ten feet beyond the building perimeter and including but not limited to outdoor educational facilities, demolition, landscaping, paving, fencing, water, electric, telephone, sanitary, storm, grading, seeding, sodding, erosion control, and fuel services.

(a-1) The maximum State construction allocation as indicated in Section 5 shall be computed to include 12 percent of the building cost for site development.

(a-2) The LEA may request that the IAC approve an expenditure in excess of the 12 percent of the building cost for site development provided that the maximum State construction allocation is not exceeded.

(a-3) This does not preclude a local board of education from paying site development costs in excess of those allowed herein.

(b) New schools that can be justified because of growth or population shifts.

(c) An addition(s) to an existing school building such as: classrooms, media center, art and music facilities. This category excludes any alteration of the existing building except for that limited work required to physically integrate the proposed addition(s) into the existing facility.

(d) A new building or part thereof to replace an existing obsolete school or part thereof in use for 40 years or more. Obsolescence shall be based on educational program requirements and/or structural considerations as determined by the Committee.

(d-1) The board of education has the option to request the Committee to consider, in lieu of replacing a school building over 40 years old, the renovation of such building, providing life cycle and cost benefit studies demonstrate the economic feasibility of modernization over replacement, and providing the total renovation construction cost does not exceed the cost of an equivalent new building which does not include the costs of site development, demolition, and air conditioning.

(e) The modernization or remodeling of an existing school building, in whole or part, with the following exceptions and limitations:

(e-1) Alteration, modification, or renovation to existing school buildings or portions thereof in use for 15 years or less from the date of occupancy shall not be eligible for State participation in the costs of construction.

(e-2) Except as allowed in (d-l), the Committee shall establish a maximum cost of construction for remodeling a school building or parts thereof. The maximum State construction allocation shall be based upon the product of the "building cost" per square foot, the number of square feet approved for the project, and the following percentages:

(e-2-a) For an approved building addition or replacement of a portion of a building over 40 years of age - 100 percent with this product increased by 12 percent for site redevelopment.

(e-2-b) For alterations within a building or portion thereof which has been occupied:

- 41 years or more - 85 percent
- from 26 to 40 years - 60 percent
- from 16 to 25 years - 50 percent
- for 15 years or less - 0 percent

(e-3) The maximum State construction allocation for modernization and remodeling shall include the costs of demolition, site development, and an amount for change orders.

(e-4) The LEA may request that the IAC approve an expenditure in excess of 12 percent of the building cost for site redevelopment provided that the maximum State construction allocation is not exceeded.

(e-5) If there is a substantial change in the type of general use proposed for the school, then a maximum gross area allowance greater than that provided for by Sections 5a and 6e-2 may be allowed by the Committee.

(f) Change orders to approved construction contracts not to exceed 1-1/2 percent of the State participation in the contract.

(g) Initial built-in equipment as defined in the Public School Construction Program Administrative Procedures Guide.

(h) Projects that have been forward funded by a local board of education, when approved by the Board of Public Works and under the Rules, Regulations, and Procedures in effect at the time of Board of Public Works approval, including the Board of Public Works' determination of the eligible portion of each project.

(i) Installing by moving and relocating modular relocatable classroom buildings.

(j) Relocating on-site utilities as required to eliminate interference with the building construction.

(k) Expanding existing on-site sewer or water systems to accommodate additional student capacity.

(l) When approved by a legislative appropriation, systemic renovations within a building or portion thereof. The project allocation shall be based upon the product of the approved eligible costs and the following percentages:

(l-1) For facilities or portions thereof which have been occupied:

- 41 years or more - 85 percent
- from 26 to 40 years - 60 percent
- from 16 to 25 years - 50 percent

(l-2) Eligible costs shall be established for eligible work as defined in the Public School Construction Program Administrative Procedures Guide.

(m) Restoration of a public school building or site damaged as a result of a natural disaster subject to the approval of the Committee and the Board of Public Works.

7. INELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES

The following types of capital improvements and related expenditures will not be funded by the State and shall be assumed as a local responsibility:

(a) Contracts for the construction of regional or central administrative offices, warehousing, resource, printing, vehicle storage, or maintenance facilities.

(b) A/E or other consultant fees.

(c) Related construction costs such as: permits, test borings, soil analysis, bid advertising, water and sewer connection charges, topographical surveys, models, renderings, or cost estimating.

(d) Cost of acquisition or purchase of sites.

(e) Cost of leasing or purchasing of facilities for school use, except where such leasing or purchasing is part of a tax-exempt financing transaction for a forward funded school construction project approved by the Board of Public Works.

(f) Relocation costs for occupants of a site.

(g) Salaries of local employees.

(h) Administrative costs for developing master plans, programs, educational specifications, inspection of construction, or equipment specifications.

(i) The costs of furnishing and installing movable furniture and equipment.

(j) Art work required by local ordinance.

(k) Cost of owner's liability and builder's risk insurance.

(l) Costs of an individual contract expressly for maintenance and/or repair.

(m) Off-site development costs beyond the property line.

(n) All construction costs for work, whether in new construction, alterations, or additions, site development or redevelopment, in excess of the State approved maximum allocation.

(o) Systemic renovations for school buildings that are not properly maintained.

In any case where a local board desires to proceed with a capital improvement project, or part thereof which is ineligible for State funding, the Committee shall determine the added cost to the approved project generated by the ineligible aspects, and the local board may proceed with the project but without State funding for the added cost.

8. COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Cooperative arrangements for sharing facilities among two or more school systems, or among educational and non-educational governmental agencies, shall be encouraged. The Committee shall determine what part of the cost of constructing such facilities is fairly assignable to educational agencies, and such part shall be eligible for State payment.

Cooperative arrangements for the use of school facilities for community or recreational purposes shall be encouraged. In every case, only that share of capital improvement costs which, in the judgment of the Committee, is fairly assignable to educational purposes, as distinguished from recreational or community purposes, shall be eligible for State payment.

9. REVIEW AND/OR APPROVAL OF SITES, BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION PLANS, AND CONTRACTS

(a) The Committee shall review and approve: I) all proposals for the acquisition or disposition of school sites or buildings; 2) the architectural program and schematic plans for school capital improvement projects for which State payment of costs is sought; and 3) all awards of construction contracts by the local board funded under this program.

(b) A capital improvement project shall proceed as a State funded project when the construction contract award has been approved in writing by the Committee or the Board of Public Works as prescribed herein. If the Committee does not approve the contracts and proposals as submitted, it shall state in writing the reasons for its disapproval.

(c) Design development and construction documents will be reviewed by the IAC staff and its written comments communicated to the local educational agency. Such comments will be advisory only and basically for verification of funding sufficiency. The LEA has the sole responsibility for bidding a project within the State and local allocations.

10. APPEALS

Whenever a local board or governing body wishes to appeal any decision of the Committee, such party, after giving notice to the Committee, may appear at the next meeting of the Board of Public Works, and, after hearing a presentation of the opposing views, the Board shall make a final determination.

11. COMMITTEE GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

The Committee shall have the responsibility for prescribing administrative procedures, guidelines, and forms to be used by local boards desiring State payment of the costs of a school capital improvement project.

12. SELECTION OF ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS

The plans, specifications, and related documents for each construction project must have been developed under the supervision and responsibility of an architect or engineer who is licensed or registered in the State of Maryland. Selection of the architect or engineer shall be made by the local board. The Committee shall be notified of the architect selected, and a copy of the approved A/E Agreement shall be filed with the Committee. However, the local A/E Agreement shall include, as terms of the contract, provisions for cost control, life cycle costing, energy conservation, a fixed limit of construction cost, and Committee review and/or approval, as described herein, of the schematic, design development, and construction documents.

13. SUBMISSION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGNS AND DESIGN DEVELOPMENT DOCUMENTS

The schematic designs prepared by the architect shall be reviewed and approved by the Committee. The design development documents approved by the local board shall be submitted to the Committee for review and comment. The design development documents shall demonstrate cost effectiveness. Energy consumption efficiency, as substantiated by life cycle cost studies, must be approved by the Department of General Services as required by the State Finance and Procurement Article, Sections 4-801 - 4-808, Annotated Code of Maryland. Within thirty (30) days of submission, the local board shall be notified in writing of the comments and recommendations of the Interagency Committee staff.

14. CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS

The construction documents shall be submitted to the Committee for final review and comment, and for comparison with the project's approved maximum State construction allocation and authorization to bid. The documents shall include all necessary approvals by appropriate State and local fire, health, sediment control and storm water management agencies; such approvals to be final subject to subsequent inspection as to compliance. Alternates should be established to enable the award of a contract within the available State and/or local funds. Comments in writing by the Committee staff shall be based upon the construction documents submitted and shall not be construed to include any subsequent changes in the construction documents.

15. AWARDS OF CONTRACTS

Awards of contracts shall be made by, and in the name of, the local board to the lowest responsible bidder meeting the requirements of the bidding documents in accordance with the Public School Laws, after the award of contract has been approved by the Committee. If the lowest responsible bidder's proposal exceeds the maximum State construction allocation, the local jurisdiction can (a) supplement the State allocation (and assume responsibility for all change orders), (b) revise and rebid (with no subsequent adjustment in State funds), or (c) cancel the project. Each local board shall adopt procedures for prequalification of bidders on contracts, and an attempt to include minority business enterprises in contracts. The Committee shall assist in the development of such procedures. Contracts and Requisitions for Payment shall be in a standard form. Construction contracts shall include a performance and payment bond payable both to the local owner and to the State. The State shall not pay any fees for local building permits and shall not require any local board to obtain a building permit as a condition of approval unless the local subdivision requires it. Local boards shall be required to furnish adequate inspection of all construction projects. During construction, the Committee may arrange for periodic inspection by State inspectors of the project.

16. METHOD OF PAYMENT

Payment will be made by the State directly to the contractor or vendor upon receipt and review of a request for payment from the LEA for eligible expenditures against the approved contract, and payment should be made within twenty-five (25) days from the receipt of the invoice by the LEA. Payments may be made by the State to the LEA as reimbursement for eligible expenditures made against approved contracts with documentation indicating that the contractor or vendor has been paid the amount requested for reimbursement.

17. REVERSIONS

Any project approved for funding with an allocation in the State Public School Construction Capital Improvement Program of record which has not been contracted for within two years from the effective date of approval shall be deemed to be abandoned. If justified by unusual circumstances, the Committee, with the approval of the Board of Public Works, may extend the allowable time for placing a project under contract. The amount of the unexpended allocation for such an abandoned project shall be transferred to the Statewide Contingency Account of the fiscal year in which the project was approved for funding, and the project shall be removed from the State Public School Construction funding accounts. To be considered for reinstatement, the project must be submitted as a new project in a succeeding fiscal year's annual capital program as required under Section 4.

18. AMENDMENTS AND REVISIONS

Prior to the adoption or approval of any proposed amendments or revisions to these Rules, Regulations, and Procedures, the Board of Public Works will:

(a) Notify local boards of education and county governing bodies of the proposed changes to allow for their review and comments; and

(b) Submit the proposed changes to the Legislative Policy Committee of the Maryland General Assembly for a period of at least 30 days to provide for their review and comments.

PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION IN MARYLAND
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A primary objective of Maryland's school financing system has been to establish and maintain a substantial measure of local control over the public school system. Concern over significant variation in the quality of education provided among the subdivisions led to the enactment in 1922 of the State's first equalization law for education finance. While the State's aid program was limited to current expenses - staffing, salaries, and other costs of instruction - the law embodied the principle that all the wealth of the State, wherever situated, would be taxed, up to a reasonable level, to educate children wherever they live. This system of State financing provided no assistance for the cost of school construction.

The Incentive Fund for School Construction

In 1947, the Maryland Commission on the Distribution of Tax Revenues (Sherbow Commission) recognized that the State's lack of contribution to school construction costs had:

> ...resulted in a highly variable quality of school buildings in the State, many of which are totally inadequate or sub-standard.

To address this issue, the Sherbow Commission recommended an incentive plan to provide State funds for the construction of school buildings and facilities. As a result, the first program of State construction aid was enacted, known as Incentive Aid for School Construction.

The Incentive Fund offered the subdivisions a State grant for the difference between $10 per pupil enrolled and the amount raised by a local tax levy of 5 cents per $100 of assessed property value. Although the Incentive Fund was intended to help local governments meet ever increasing school facility needs, actual State aid under the program fell from $1.3 million to $1.1 million between 1947 and 1955. This decrease in aid was due to marked increases in the assessable base which more than offset enrollment increases. Further, while the formula was intended to be equalizing in nature, it: (1) failed to recognize actual construction needs relative to student population changes; and (2) was based on local property wealth during a period when property assessment methods varied significantly from county to county.

Between 1947 and 1954, Maryland public school enrollment increased from 276,627 to 409,570 students, a 48% change. The unexpected growth in student population resulted in almost 13,000 pupils on half shifts, 4,600 in rented quarters, and over 26,000 in makeshift quarters in school buildings. To address this crisis, and in view of 5-year enrollment projections which envisioned another significant increase, the Commission to Study Education and Finance (Green Commission) was asked to review public school construction financing needs. The Green Commission was guided in its work by the Maryland State Debt and Finance Commission of 1954 (Grotz Commission), which was charged by Governor McKeldin with the investigation of State debt.

Source: Fiscal Services (10/15/92)

With regard to public school construction, the Grotz Commission concluded that: (1) the State should not create public debt to finance school construction; (2) the State should cease lending its credit to the localities; and (3) the localities had sufficient credit to finance, through the creation of debt, all foreseeable school construction.

In consideration of these findings, the Green Commission recommended that the State continue to provide school construction aid to the local governments in the form of general funds rather than public debt. It further recommended that: (1) aid be provided through the Incentive Fund formula; and (2) the level of State aid per pupil enrolled be increased. This latter recommendation was conditioned upon the concern that no Incentive Fund increase be enacted without accompanying legislation that would standardize property assessment values used in the Incentive Fund calculation.

Consequently, the Incentive Fund formula was amended in 1956 to allow an increase in the per pupil enrolled allowance to $15 for FY 1957 and to $20 for FY 1958.

In 1961, the formula was further revised to increase the per pupil allowance to $22 and provide an additional allocation of $70 for each new pupil in recognition of enrollment changes. This formula remained unchanged until its repeal in 1967, when it was replaced by the 1967 School Construction Aid Program.

Loan Assistance Programs

Despite the Grotz and Green Commission recommendations that no new State debt or credit be issued on behalf of local governments, two loan-type programs were initiated after World War II that extended the State's credit for school construction purposes. The programs were in response to the backlog of facility needs that had developed during the depression and war years and as a result of the baby boom that followed. The two programs were:

- The General Public School Assistance Loan of 1949 (State Grant-In-Aid Fund); and
- The General Public School Construction Loan.

The State Grant-in-Aid Fund was established in 1949 as a 5-year program of special-purpose grants. It was intended to help the subdivisions respond to school building needs brought about by the abnormal increase in school population following World War II. The Grant-in-Aid Fund legislation authorized $20 million in bonds to be made available to the subdivisions on a 1:3 (State/Local) matching basis. The program was not extended beyond the initial 5-year period.

The Public School Construction Loan, also created in 1949, authorized $50 million in bonds in the first year, the proceeds of which were to be used to finance the construction of public school buildings, facilities, and

the acquisition of land on which to construct the buildings. Under the program, the Board of Public Works made school construction loans upon recommendation by the State Department of Education. The Interagency Committee on School Construction assumed responsibility for making loan recommendations in 1982.

Loans were based upon demonstrated need, but within entitlements which reflected size of enrollment. Bonds were sold by the State and the proceeds were loaned to the subdivisions. The local governments were required to reimburse the State for all costs of debt service by having funds withheld from various State payments due the local governments, including the income tax, the tax on racing, the recordation tax, the amusement tax, and the license tax. The loan program has not been used since 1983 although the authorizing statute remains in the Education Article.

The total of such loans issued for elementary and secondary schools over the life of the program is as follows.

Year	Amount
1949	$ 50,000,000
1953	20,000,000
1956	75,000,000
1962	20,000,000
1963	50,000,000
1965	50,000,000
1967	50,000,000
1970	50,000,000
1973	25,000,000
1981	2,000,000
1982	2,000,000
1983	900,000
	$394,900,000

State Aid for Construction of Vocational Education Facilities

Between 1965 and 1969, Maryland authorized State debt for the purpose of making grants for the construction of vocational education facilities. Under the program, the State paid a percentage share of the cost of construction equal to the current expense equalization share, but not less than 50%. State bonds authorized under this program were as follows:

Year	Amount
1965	$ 10,000,000
1967	10,000,000
1969	10,000,000
	$ 30,000,000

This program was discontinued after adoption of the 1971 School Construction Program. Since that time, construction funding for vocational education facilities has been included in the annual capital improvement program along with all other local project requests.

Public School Construction Aid Program of 1967

The 1967 School Construction Aid program, which replaced the Incentive Fund for School Construction, was enacted after some years of study by various committees and commissions. The formula that was adopted and remained in effect through FY 1971 was recommended by the 1966 Committee on Taxation and Fiscal Matters. The 1967 program provided for:

- Support for 80% of the cost of construction up to $1,500 per pupil housed;
- Support for 80% of annual interest and redemption payments for debt outstanding or obligated as of June 30, 1967;
- The State's share of (1) and (2) the same as its percentage share of the current expense foundation program with a minimum guarantee of 35%; and
- State aid for the establishment and support of kindergartens.

As can be seen from the following data, the 1967 program resulted in significant increases in state aid for school construction and debt service between FY 1968 and FY 1971.

Fiscal Year	State Aid Under 1967 School Construction Program		
	Construction	Debt Service	Total
1965-66	$ 1,609,676	$11,705,929	$ 13,315,605
1966-67	646,614	11,543,594	12,190,208
1967-68	17,732,724	22,568,064	40,300,788
1968-69	29,578,049	17,601,898	47,179,947
1969-70	32,398,752	21,961,705	54,360,457
1970-71	44,341,889	23,412,212	67,754,101

The assumption of a portion of outstanding debt service as of June 30, 1967 was an attempt to provide equitable treatment for those subdivisions which had tried to keep pace with school building needs. The 80% figure was a device to balance costs with available State resources and the $1,500 per pupil figure was considered to be the reasonable cost of housing a student. The program remained in effect until it was replaced by the 1971 school construction program.

Public School Construction Program in 1971

In response to growing calls for local tax relief and for State assumption of all the costs of public primary and secondary education, Governor Mandel in 1971 proposed the establishment of a:

> ...comprehensive program under which the State will assume the entire cost of school construction in every county and city of the State.

At the same time, the Commission to Study the State's Role in Financing Public Education (Hughes Commission) issued its final report with the following recommendations:

- That the existing equalization formula be replaced by a single formula, with the State supporting 55% of the operating costs of programs in each subdivision based on prior-year per-pupil expenditures.

- That the State reimburse the subdivisions: (1) for full approved cost of all construction of public elementary and secondary schools for which contracts were let after July 1, 1971; (2) for full cost of debt service for obligations incurred for contracts signed, or for direct payments made for school construction, between February 1, 1971, and June 30, 1971; and (3) for debt service requirements for obligations outstanding as of June 30, 1967.

In view of its cost (an estimated $164 million), the Hughes Commission did not press for immediate enactment of the first recommendation. However, the second recommendation, with the full endorsement of the Governor, was enacted into law by the 1971 General Assembly. The 1971 initiative, commonly referred to as the "new" program, became the foundation for Maryland's current school construction program by which payments are made on behalf of local governments for approved school construction costs.

By contrast, the State's assumption of pre-1967 local debt is often referred to as the "old" program and, for State aid purposes, is considered a direct grant program. By FY 1993, the State has retired roughly $750 million of the $755 million in pre-1967 State-assumed debt.

The statute establishing the school building construction aid program left details of administration and implementation to be determined by the Board of Public Works through rules and regulations. To implement the "new" program, with an initial bond authorization of $150 million, the Board adopted Rules, Regulations, and Procedures for the Administration of the School Construction Program and the Public School Construction Program Administrative Procedures Guide in June 1971, thereby establishing the Interagency Committee on School Construction. The Interagency Committee has supervised and administered the "new" program since that time.

Early Modifications to the "New" School Construction Program

Since its enactment in 1971, four task forces have examined the "new" program with respect to balancing local school construction needs with the State's ability to pay.

The first significant revision of the program's operating guidelines occurred in 1977, under the recommendations of the Commission to Study Revision of the School Construction Program (James Commission). The James Commission report resulted in an increase in the local share of school construction costs when the Board of Public Works adopted the following recommendations:

- o A State funding limitation of $15,000 per acre for site development work ten feet beyond the perimeter of a building site;
- o A reduction of State participation for school renovation projects;
- o A reduction in the percentage allowable for State funding of movable furniture and equipment;
- o Elimination of State funding for administrative office construction;
- o Local assumption of all architectural/engineering and consultant fees incurred; and
- o Elimination of State funding for specified pre-construction expenses.

Creation of the Capital Debt Affordability Committee

Of major consequence to the school construction program and to State debt in general was the James Commission recommendation that a Capital Debt Affordability Committee be created under the Executive Department:

> ...to be responsible for reviewing the size and condition of the State debt and preparing an annual debt affordability analysis.

The Capital Debt Affordability Committee consists of the Treasurer (Chairman), the Comptroller, the Secretaries of Budget and Fiscal Planning and Transportation, and one appointee of the Governor. The Committee is required to review the size and condition of the State debt and to submit annually to the Governor and General Assembly by September 10th a recommended debt authorization level. The placement of the Committee within the executive branch means that consideration of debt affordability occurs when the State's capital program is formulated.

By October 15th of each year, the Governor is required to provide a preliminary allocation of new general obligation debt which he deems advisable for general construction, school construction, and other special projects. Further, within 20 days after the General Assembly convenes, the Governor must submit legislation on a consolidated loan budget which reflects the dollar amount and percentage allocated for each project.

Further Modifications to the "New" Program

In 1981, the Board of Public Works incorporated certain recommendations of a 1979 gubernatorial Task Force to evaluate the Public School Construction Program within the Program's Rules, Regulations, and Procedures (R,R,&P). The recommendations that resulted in significant change include:

- Establishment of a tentative maximum State construction budget based on a formula for design purposes, and then a maximum State construction allocation when the project is reviewed for construction funding;

- An allowance of up to 12% of the maximum State building cost for site development;

- A revised sliding scale to govern State funding for renovation projects;

- Required submission of educational facility master plans by school districts, with annual updates;

- Elimination of approval requirements for project design and construction documents while retaining a State review and comment requirement; and

- Local assumption of any project costs exceeding the State's maximum construction allocation.

In 1986, and again in 1988, the Board adopted additional task force recommendations that further increased the local share of school construction costs. The 1986 changes, as proposed by the 1985 Task Force to Examine the School Construction Program, made movable equipment ineligible for funding and made systemic renovations and restorations due to natural disaster eligible for program funding.

The changes recommended by the 1987 Task Force on School Construction Finance incorporated a state/local shared cost formula into the "new" program beginning in FY 1989. Under this recent modification, the State has provided the following level of assistance for eligible construction costs through FY 1993.

State's Percent Share of Approved Costs

75%	65%	55%	50%
Baltimore City	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore
Caroline	Carroll	Kent	Calvert
Cecil	Charles	Prince George's	Howard
Garrett	Dorchester	Queen Anne's	Montgomery
Somerset	Frederick		Talbot
	Harford		Worcester
	St. Mary's		
	Washington		
	Wicomico		

The changes that have been made to the R.R.&P since 1971 directly affect the shared cost relationship between the State and local education agencies. Under the current R.R.&P it is estimated that local funding represents between 37 and 77 percent of a project's cost. Land acquisition is a local responsibility which is not eligible for State funding and has not been included in this analysis.

Typical Ranges of Local Costs for a School Construction Project (Estimated)

Costs:	1971-1977	1978-1981	1982-1986	1987-1988	1989-1993
Construction	0 - 5%	0 - 12%	0 - 10%	0 - 10%	25 - 50%
Site Work	0 - 2	0 - 4	0 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 1
Architectural/ Engineering	0 - 1	4 - 5	4 - 5	4 - 5	4 - 5
Related Contracts	0 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 1	0 - 1
Equipment	0 - 2	0 - 7	0 - 5	5 - 10	5 - 10
TOTAL	0 - 11%	4 - 29%	4 - 22%	9 - 27%	34 - 77%

Infrastructure Loan Program

In recognition that adoption of the state/local shared cost formula would increase the school construction obligations of the local governments, the 1987 Task Force recommended that a "level playing field" for local public school construction borrowing be established.

To this end, the Board of Public Works adopted a policy to authorize the counties to participate in the Infrastructure Loan Program offered by the Community Development Administration under the Department of Housing and Community Development; thus providing the counties access to the State's AAA bond rating. Further, the Board approved State funding of a portion of the insurance costs associated with the AAA rating to enable low-wealth counties to participate.

Only Caroline County has used the Infrastructure Loan Program for school construction purposes, and this was prior to adoption of the insurance cost assistance.

Asbestos Removal Program

In 1985, a new section of law was added to the Education Article which created an asbestos removal fund for the purpose of providing grants to county boards. For FY 1986, $10 million was appropriated contingent upon a supplemental State cigarette tax which would take effect only if the Federal government allowed the federal tax to fall below 16 cents per pack.

This action came at a time when the federal government was facing a budget crisis. Consequently, the federal cigarette tax was not reduced, a supplemental State cigarette tax did not take effect, and the Asbestos Removal Fund was never funded. In general, asbestos removal is eligible for funding under the "new" program when it is part of an approved renovation project; it is not eligible when requested as an independent project.

FOOTNOTES

A number of documents have been used in compiling this historic overview of school construction finance in Maryland.

- Report of the Maryland Commission on the Distribution of Tax Revenues September 30, 1946
- Report of Maryland Commission to Study Education and Finance March 1955
- Full State Funding of School Construction in Maryland - An Appraisal After Two Years October 1973
- Report of the Commission to Study Revision of the School Construction Program January 15, 1977
- The State of Maryland Public School Construction Program 1971-1981 June 1982
- Report of the Governor's Task Force to Evaluate the Public School Construction Program August 1, 1979
- Report of the Task Force to Examine the School Construction Program November 1, 1985
- Report of the Task Force on School Construction Finance November 10, 1987
- The Annotated Code of Maryland:
  Education, Section 5, Subtitle 3
  State Finance and Procurement, Subtitle 8, Part II

COST AND IMPACT OF THE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM 1971-1993

Program Components

The Public School Construction Program has had a significant financial impact on State and Local government. Since July, 1971, the State has funded the cost of the School Construction Program and has assumed each school district's bond debt which was obligated or outstanding as of June 30, 1967.

Thus, there are two cost components to the State's School Construction Program:

(1) "New Program" debt service contracted by the State after July 1, 1971 for approved eligible costs of construction of public schools; and

(2) Local debt assumed by the State for contracts let by the subdivisions for public school construction prior to June 30, 1967.

Funds to pay the debt service are from general fund revenues and State property taxes and are budgeted to the State Department of Education.

The fiscal objective of the programs had been to relieve the subdivisions of the financial obligation to provide needed educational facilities. The major portion of the financial burden of school construction costs has been shifted from the subdivisions to the State.

The following summarizes the two cost components of the program.

(1) "New Program"

Since the inception of the "new program" in FY 1972, the State has received requests from local boards of education annually which have been as high as $427 million (FY'72) and as low as $147 million (FY'83). During the past five years the annual requests have been approximately $200 million. Over the same period the State has authorized almost $2 billion to finance the costs of the new construction program. The interest rate has ranged from a low of 4.3% (January, 1972) to a high of 11.3% (November, 1981).

Exhibit I presents the funds requested, authorization levels, reallocated funds, total of funds allocated (against requests), and the percentage of requests funded for each year of the program. The percent of total funds allocated when compared to requests for a typical year averages approximately 48 percent. It should be noted that over $1 billion (half of the $2 billion total) was allocated during the first five years of the program (FY'72-FY'76). Requests declined to under $100 million for a period of years between FY'81-FY'87 and State funds allocated during this same period were in the range of $27 million (FY'84) to $52 million (FY'82). Requests for State funding have been approximately $200 million each year since FY'88 and State funds allocated have been in the range of $58 million (FY'88) to $88 million (FY'90).

Source: Public School Construction Program January 21, 1993

Exhibit II presents a summary of the annual and five year statewide public school capital improvement program requests for the period FY'90-FY'94. The average for a fiscal year based upon a review of the fiscal year of the submission is in the range of $138 million to $157 million. The fiscal year 1994 average for FY'94-FY'99 is $142 million.

Exhibit III reflects the allocation of the $1.95 billion school construction authorizations to the subdivisions under the "new program" through FY 1993. These allocations represent the principal (State funds) provided for approved projects and do not reflect the interest on the debt.

Exhibit IV reflects by subdivision the actual debt service costs (i.e., principal and interests) incurred by the State for the Public School Construction Program since its inception in FY 1972. With respect to the "new program" costs, $2.164 billion has been or will be expended through FY 1993 as shown in column 1.

Exhibit V summarized by fiscal year the State payments (principal and interest) by fiscal year for FY'72 through FY'93 (estimated) in column 1. This figure totals in excess of $2.163 billion.

(2) Local Debt Assumed

As a result of assuming the county debt service obligations, the State assumed costs of $755.6 million for the following 3 types of obligations:

- obligations to pay interest and principal on debt issued prior to June 30, 1967 by the counties to finance school construction ($594.1 million).

- obligations of the subdivisions to pay interest and principal on State issued debt prior to June 30, 1967 under the General Public School Construction Loan (GPSCL) program. It should be noted that this program, through which the State issued bonds to loan funds to the subdivisions, continued after fiscal 1967 however these obligations of the subdivisions were not assumed by the State ($105.2 million).

- obligations for debt service on GPSCL and county bonds that were issued after June 30, 1967 for construction payments on "contracts let" prior to June 30, 1967. This category was assumed by the State pursuant to Chapter 245 Acts of 1973 ($56.3 million).

Of the $755.6 million in assumed obligations, Exhibits IV and V show that the State has or will have paid $737 million through FY 1993 (column 2). The balance will be repaid through 1998.

State Cost of Program

Exhibits IV and V summarize by subdivision and fiscal year the total cost of the School Construction Program to the State. It shows that $2.9 billion has been or will be expended through FY 1993. Costs have grown in each fiscal year through 1986 as the result of the very large authorization levels (ranging from $150 million to $300 million annually) in the early years of the program coupled with new authorizations (ranging from $22 million to $69 million) in the following years (refer to Exhibit I). Based on the sustained new authorization levels in recent years ($44 million - FY'90 to $69 million FY'93) the obligations incurred by the State for bonds sold or to be sold will require repayments of approximately $100 million (principal and interest) annually.

Exhibit VI presents data showing that the Public School Construction Program received and disbursed State funds to the local school systems which represents approximately 31 percent of all State capital funds authorized between 1971 (FY'72) and 1992 (FY'93). This is probably the largest single State capital program which directly benefits local governments. An additional 28 percent of all State capital funds was allocated for other non-state projects during this same period of time. These two categories of non-state projects represent 58 percent of all State capital funds authorized. A list of the types of non-state projects is provided on Exhibit VII. The remaining 41 percent of the State capital funds were used for State owned projects.

Exhibit I

COMPARISON OF TOTAL ANNUAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) REQUESTS, ANNUAL AUTHORIZATIONS, AND ALLOCATIONS

($000 omitted)

Fiscal Year	Funds Requested (1)	Authorized (2)	Reallocated Funds (3)	Total Funds Allocated	Percent Allocated to Requests
1972	$ 427,200	$ 150,000	-	$ 150,000	35.1
1973	417,062	300,000	-	300,000	71.9
1974	402,050	220,000	$ 7,392	227,392	56.6
1975	392,365	212,000	45,714	257,714	65.7
1976	320,468	160,000	-	160,000	49.9
1977	246,559	50,000	33,259	83,259	33.8
1978	202,372	69,000	15,868	84,868	41.9
1979	102,970	57,000	7,318	64,318	62.5
1980	110,772	62,000	3,000	65,000	58.7
1981	96,474	45,000	2,796	47,796	49.5
1982	88,594	45,000	7,068	52,068	58.8
1983	47,138	32,000	-	32,000	67.9
1984	58,360	22,000	5,087	27,087	46.4
1985	84,794	36,000	2,776	38,776	45.7
1986	90,241	34,600	614	35,214	39.0
1987	80,748	44,300	-	44,300	54.9
1988	174,793	57,400	797	58,197	33.3
1989	260,220	60,000 (4)	1,652	61,652	23.7
1990	170,637	88,000 (5)	-	88,000	51.6
1991	198,122	75,000 (6)	5,470	80,470	40.6
1992	204,488	60,000	4,700	64,700	31.6
1993	196,884	69,000	10,000	79,000	40.1

(1) Projects not funded in a fiscal year are usually resubmitted the following fiscal year.

(2) The authorized amounts reflect new bond authorizations and "pay-go" funding, where noted.

(3) Reallocation of State funds from the PSCP Statewide contingency account in annual CIP approved by the Board of Public Works. Funds were approved for transfer to the Statewide contingency account from previously approved projects that were (a) dropped as projects by an LEA, (b) project was bid below allocated funds, (c) reduced scope of work from original funding, (d) unexpended funds at completion of project, and/or (e) backcharges as a result of PSCP audits.

(4) Includes $ 7 million "pay-go" funds

(5) Includes $44 million "pay-go" funds

(6) Includes $22 million "pay-go" funds

Source: Interagency Committee on School Construction (12/92)

Exhibit II

SUMMARY OF ANNUAL AND FIVE-YEAR PUBLIC

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT REQUESTS

($ in millions)

Fiscal Year Submission	FY'90	FY'91	FY'92	FY'93	FY'94	FY'95	FY'96	FY'97	FY'98	FY'99	TOTAL
FY'90	170.6	210.9	130.7	126.5	136.2	147.5					922.4
FY'91		198.1	169.8	180.7	148.7	106.7	138.9				942.9
FY'92			204.5	208.1	173.9	99.0	131.6	127.2			944.3
FY'93				196.9	170.0	112.6	107.3	118.1	122.3		827.2
FY'94					206.3	142.4	130.6	139.1	121.8	110.6	850.8

D-5

Notes:

- All anticipated State funds as submitted by LEAs, based on State established square foot costs for each fiscal year of submission and local estimates for systemic renovation projects.
- Project justification and eligibility for State funding has not been determined.
- Projects not funded in a fiscal year are usually resubmitted in following fiscal year, and subsequent priorities adjusted.
- No inflation has been added for subsequent fiscal years, beyond the fiscal year of submission.

Source: Interagency Committee on School Construction (12/92)

Exhibit III

PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ALLOCATIONS
(By County)

Local Educational Agency	Total FY 1972-93
Allegany	$ 46,163,217
Anne Arundel	210,617,603
Baltimore	136,705,909
Calvert	47,981,495
Caroline	17,904,924
Carroll	72,388,933
Cecil	41,968,690
Charles	78,795,746
Dorchester	33,821,881
Frederick	93,219,957
Garrett	28,690,964
Harford	107,921,074
Howard	110,652,126
Kent	8,020,716
Montgomery	232,268,749
Prince George's	168,448,441
Queen Anne's	15,211,793
St. Mary's	41,412,757
Somerset	23,337,261
Talbot	9,434.470
Washington	51,356,894
Wicomico	36,447,113
Worcester	24,908,204
Baltimore City	287,471,135
State Projects	13,366,905
Statewide Contingency	10,283,043
Total	$1,948,800,000

Note: Reflects total allocation amounts as of 7/1/92. Figures do not reflect interest costs associated with the debt.

Source: Interagency Committee on School Construction (12/92)

Exhibit IV

STATE COSTS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION -- FY 1972-FY 1993
BY COUNTY

	COUNTY	STATE DEBT NEW PROGRAM	LOCAL DEBT ASSUMED	TOTAL
1	ALLEGANY	51,816,913	5,695,640	57,512,553
2	ANNE ARUNDEL	268,734,677	62,178,928	330,913,605
3	BALTIMORE CITY	340,119,187	164,808,202	504,927,389
4	BALTIMORE	155,444,847	144,255,454	299,700,301
5	CALVERT	45,784,416	1,235,000	47,019,416
6	CAROLINE	23,305,365	4,094,243	27,399,608
7	CARROLL	73,631,916	3,109,000	76,740,916
8	CECIL	33,943,933	7,068,000	41,011,933
9	CHARLES	79,025,242	10,335,825	89,361,067
10	DORCHESTER	47,682,580	3,936,408	51,618,988
11	FREDERICK	106,012,870	22,186,845	128,199,715
12	GARRETT	31,370,987	938,000	32,308,987
13	HARFORD	124,340,080	21,859,845	146,199,925
14	HOWARD	117,108,321	9,159,000	126,267,321
15	KENT	11,477,289	495,000	11,972,289
16	MONTGOMERY	217,939,874	93,951,839	311,891,713
17	PRINCE GEORGE'S	190,340,964	144,896,236	335,237,200
18	QUEEN ANNE'S	18,303,206	3,828,000	22,131,206
19	ST. MARY'S	45,289,933	3,346,000	48,635,933
20	SOMERSET	34,008,469	1,479,000	35,487,469
21	TALBOT	10,172,845	3,983,000	14,155,845
22	WASHINGTON	59,573,202	14,928,665	74,501,867
23	WICOMICO	45,614,731	8,646,250	54,260,981
24	WORCESTER	32,578,860	508,000	33,086,860
		2,163,620,707	736,922,380	2,900,543,087

NOTE: Cumulative state costs for the public school construction program (includes principle and interest).

Column 1 - Debt service on state-issued bonds is allocated among the counties in proportion to each counties share of bond proceeds. Calculation done by Dept. of Fiscal Services & Dept. of Budget & Fiscal Planning.

Column 2 - The state assumed the costs of the debt service on local school construction bonds.

Column 3 - Reflects total cost to the state through FY 1993 FY 1992 and FY 1993 are estimates).

PREPARED BY: Department of Fiscal Services, January 1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Exhibit V

STATE COSTS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION -- FY 1972-FY 1993

FISCAL YEAR	STATE DEBT NEW PROGRAM	LOCAL DEBT ASSUMED	TOTAL
1972	1,985,999	62,921,000	64,906,999
1973	1,417,154	59,757,000	61,174,154
1974	9,156,062	61,486,000	70,642,062
1975	20,623,000	58,127,000	78,750,000
1976	34,241,000	57,662,000	91,903,000
1977	52,118,000	56,275,000	108,393,000
1978	70,739,000	53,693,000	124,432,000
1979	85,337,000	48,468,000	133,805,000
1980	99,951,000	44,322,000	144,273,000
1981	111,497,000	40,275,000	151,772,000
1982	124,969,000	35,700,000	160,669,000
1983	134,257,000	29,363,000	163,620,000
1984	146,066,000	27,211,000	173,277,000
1985	153,412,000	24,143,000	177,555,000
1986	157,944,000	20,225,000	178,169,000
1987	162,532,000	15,132,079	177,664,079
1988	156,602,000	9,709,732	166,311,732
1989	154,853,718	10,292,565	165,146,283
1990	147,435,109	6,835,024	154,270,133
1991	132,837,987	6,546,839	139,384,826
1992 est.	113,193,480	5,636,909	118,830,389
1993 est.	92,453,198	3,141,232	95,594,430
TOTAL	2,163,620,707	736,922,380	2,900,543,087

NOTE: Includes principle and interest. FY 1992 and FY 1993 are estimates.

PREPARED BY: Department of Fiscal Services, Janaury 1993

Exhibit VI

FUNDS AUTHORIZED FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS
MARYLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY 1971 - 1992

	STATE-OWNED		NON-STATE OWNED				TOTAL AUTHORIZATION
YEAR	State-owned funding	%	PSCP Funding	%	Other Funding	%	
1971	96,097,500	34.7	150,000,000	54.1	31,125,000	11.2	277,222,500
1972	139,207,500	29.3	300,000,000	63.2	35,378,000	7.5	474,585,500
1973	110,081,700	25.3	220,000,000	50.6	104,482,900	24.1	434,564,600
1974	90,815,300	22.1	212,000,000	51.6	108,013,800	26.3	410,829,100
1975	110,730,723	30.4	160,000,000	44.0	93,225,000	25.6	363,955,723
1976	64,536,000	37.0	50,000,000	28.7	59,900,000	34.3	174,436,000
1977	90,434,200	51.0	69,000,000	38.9	17,812,860	10.1	177,247,060
1978	102,158,200	46.6	57,000,000	26.0	59,966,800	27.4	219,125,000
1979	79,842,100	46.4	62,000,000	36.1	30,091,400	17.5	171,933,500
1980	125,233,817	52.3	45,000,000	18.8	69,257,500	28.9	239,491,317
1981	93,353,000	53.8	45,000,000	26.0	35,039,000	20.2	173,392,000
1982	97,308,000	51.5	32,000,000	16.9	59,722,000	31.6	189,030,000
1983	99,321,000	51.0	22,000,000	11.3	73.382,500	37.7	194,703,500
1984	118,863,000	57.4	36,000,000	17.4	52,239,900	25.2	207,102,900
1985	85,287,000	26.6	34,600,000	10.8	200,920,000	62.6	320,807,000
1986	90,480,000	41.2	44,300,000	20.2	84,736,500	38.6	219,516,500
1987	109,329,000	41.8	57,400,000	21.9	95,176,000	36.3	261,905,000
1988	176,985,000	51.0	60,250,000	17.3	110,106,000	31.7	347,341,000
1989	250,331,250	51.2	88,500,000	18.1	150,078,775	30.7	488,910,025
1990	171,035,500	40.2	75,250,000	17.7	178,871,929	42.1	425,157,429
1991	175,945,048	48.8	60,000,000	16.6	124,645,076	34.6	360,590,124
1992	160,182,500	43.5	69,000,000	18.8	138,526,500	37.7	367,709,000
	2,637,557,338	40.6	1,949,300,000	30.0	1,912,697,440	29.4	6,499,554,778
Authorizations Cancelled	34,966,600		0		130,575,000 [1]		165,541,600
TOTAL	2,602,590,738	41.1	1,949,300,000	30.8	1,782,122,440 [1]	28.1	6,334,013,178

Notes: [1] Supplemental Public School Construction Loans for the period 1971-1992 total $29,900,000 and are included in the Non-State Owned-Other Category.

Source: Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning (1/93)

Exhibit VII

SAMPLES OF NON-STATE OWNED CAPITAL PROJECTS

Adult Day Care Centers

Chesapeake Bay Water Quality Program

Civic/Convention Center Loans

County Jail/Detention Center Loan

Elderly Citizens Center Loans

Energy Conservation Loans

Flood Control

General Public Junior or Community College Construction Loan

Home Financing

Homeless Centers

Industrial/Commercial/Small Business Development Loans

Maryland Housing Fund Loan

Maryland Rehabilitation Housing Loan

Museums/Zoo/Theater Loans

Outdoor Recreation Loan

Preservation of Historic Buildings

Private Colleges and Universities Capital Improvement Loans

River/Creek Dredging Loans

Shore Erosion Control Loans

Stadium Improvement Loans

State Public School Construction and Capital Improvement Loan

Supplemental Public School Construction Loan

Water Quality Loan

TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

PUBLIC SCHOOL HISTORICAL ENROLLMENTS 1981-1991

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
BALTIMORE CITY	120380	116287	113320	109611	107933	107090	105906	103013	103274	103565	105031
ALLEGANY COUNTY	12863	12546	12251	11757	11657	11528	11323	11179	11053	10992	11071
ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY	67516	65530	64387	63507	63503	63802	64213	63863	63540	64339	65981
BALTIMORE COUNTY	92218	87723	83931	80964	79980	79229	80228	81070	82751	85183	88188
CALVERT COUNTY	7712	7677	7775	7921	8029	8392	8913	9257	9751	10210	10823
CAROLINE COUNTY	4490	4365	4362	4292	4301	4360	4381	4444	4586	4743	4847
CARROLL COUNTY	19736	19398	19194	19362	19600	20041	20554	20869	21131	21690	22298
CECIL COUNTY	12575	12385	12187	11998	12001	12032	12063	12335	12399	12628	13007
CHARLES COUNTY	17354	16911	16761	16666	16747	17058	17535	17880	18109	18499	18936
DORCHESTER COUNTY	5185	5059	5040	4891	4797	4796	4814	4800	4654	4658	4735
FREDERICK COUNTY	23343	23122	23141	23396	23733	24616	25192	25645	26031	26576	27603
GARRETT COUNTY	5340	5227	5117	5107	5076	5043	5057	5097	5034	5031	5029
HARFORD COUNTY	29819	28576	27712	27303	27445	27830	28550	29018	29675	30906	32210
HOWARD COUNTY	24803	24195	23936	24259	24931	25539	26587	27557	28823	29863	31468
KENT COUNTY	2657	2522	2459	2407	2371	2348	2318	2369	2439	2508	2530
MONTGOMERY COUNTY	94631	91158	90133	90582	91715	93158	94896	97095	98588	101863	105393
PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY	116121	111747	108167	105817	102947	102598	103395	104112	105595	107137	109772
QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY	4604	4597	4573	4619	4682	4808	5019	5174	5200	5288	5408
ST. MARY'S COUNTY	11444	11040	10788	10742	10926	11265	11565	11812	11851	12173	12551
SOMERSET COUNTY	3506	3640	3356	3266	3259	3252	3264	3223	3254	3251	3257
TALBOT COUNTY	3852	3758	3657	3679	3667	3784	3796	3801	3877	4008	4096
WASHINGTON COUNTY	19054	18539	17922	17630	17355	17118	17143	16989	17164	17469	17761
WICOMICO COUNTY	11590	11468	11293	11301	11376	11612	11848	12169	12355	12587	12938
WORCESTER COUNTY	5071	4958	4949	5001	5069	5096	5205	5294	5434	5649	5738
STATE TOTAL	715864	692428	676411	666078	663100	666395	673765	678065	686568	700816	720671

DATA PREPARED BY MARYLAND OFFICE OF PLANNING

PUBLIC SCHOOL HISTORICAL 1991 AND PROJECTED ENROLLMENT 1992-2001

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
BALTIMORE CITY	105031	106370	107600	109050	110650	111330	111000	110220	108640	107330	105800
ALLEGANY COUNTY	11071	11130	11150	11170	11170	11090	11060	10980	10870	10800	10720
ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY	65981	67240	69050	70760	72220	73580	74630	75280	75610	75690	75680
BALTIMORE COUNTY	88188	91100	93810	96830	99760	102560	104070	105050	105560	105380	104820
CALVERT COUNTY	10823	11380	11950	12530	13070	13480	13910	14220	14510	14760	14980
CAROLINE COUNTY	4847	4920	5040	5160	5290	5380	5460	5510	5550	5530	5530
CARROLL COUNTY	22298	23150	23900	24980	25830	26760	27550	28230	28830	29310	29880
CECIL COUNTY	13007	13410	13800	14220	14510	14770	15020	15200	15360	15430	15490
CHARLES COUNTY	18936	19530	20160	21030	21830	22610	23380	24060	24660	25180	25730
DORCHESTER COUNTY	4735	4820	4920	5060	5170	5220	5270	5280	5280	5260	5260
FREDERICK COUNTY	27603	28460	29320	30310	31520	32520	33310	33900	34430	34820	35200
GARRETT COUNTY	5029	5030	5050	5060	5130	5140	5100	5080	5060	5050	5070
HARFORD COUNTY	32210	33480	34520	35640	36720	37700	38520	38730	38730	38590	38400
HOWARD COUNTY	31468	33200	35260	37310	38990	40500	41980	43330	44600	45720	46590
KENT COUNTY	2530	2570	2650	2750	2790	2810	2840	2850	2820	2810	2770
MONTGOMERY COUNTY	105393	109900	115600	120300	124960	129310	131950	133830	135370	136750	137520
PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY	109772	112470	116030	119380	122570	124990	125780	126480	126550	126350	125800
QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY	5408	5650	5860	6080	6300	6540	6730	6920	7060	7200	7300
ST. MARY'S COUNTY	12551	12880	13320	13820	14410	14940	15100	15210	15250	15180	15120
SOMERSET COUNTY	3257	3260	3250	3260	3250	3230	3200	3190	3150	3140	3120
TALBOT COUNTY	4096	4190	4290	4430	4590	4620	4650	4680	4630	4610	4550
WASHINGTON COUNTY	17761	18050	18410	18830	19240	19500	19630	19590	19560	19520	19420
WICOMICO COUNTY	12938	13120	13330	13590	13830	13950	13970	13950	13970	13950	13840
WORCESTER COUNTY	5738	5950	6150	6380	6620	6500	6570	6630	6690	6680	6640
STATE TOTAL	720671	741240	764410	787930	810220	829020	840660	848370	852720	855010	855250

ALL PROJECTED FIGURES ROUNDED TO NEAREST TEN
PROJECTIONS PREPARED BY MARYLAND OFFICE OF PLANNING

MARYLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

FACILITIES INVENTORY
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION BY DECADE (1)

	1800 1899	1900 1909	1910 1919	1920 1929	1930 1939	1940 1949	1950 1959	1960 1969	1970 1979	1980 1989	1990 1999	TOTAL
Allegany			7,712	100,600	333,914	141,832	431,217	309,171	558,376	20,937	16,425	1,920,184
A. Arundel	30,151			16,613	46,833	164,769	1,481,035	3,201,866	5,115,093	721,466	38,205	10,816,031
Baltimore		42,000	32,820	300,956	250,501	883,244	3,531,603	5,813,275	2,651,459	346,908	169,658	14,022,424
Calvert						50,525	43,003	119,319	638,993	182,294	212,843	1,246,977
Caroline					10,700		124,483	194,413	398,577	22,492		750,665
Carroll				35,500	229,284	108,588	424,959	443,421	1,142,220	443,601	208,126	3,035,699
Cecil				10,070	146,706		513,618	447,835	346,412	117,235	188,610	1,770,486
Charles					12,648	12,976	234,573	814,201	1,069,164	177,268	249,323	2,570,153
Dorchester							187,526	19,362	491,886	84,108	4,205	787,087
Frederick				30,150	133,396		434,985	1,080,205	1,210,069	536,792	336,738	3,762,335
Garrett				22,400	5,634	2,071	232,380	112,206	268,798	82,095		725,584
Harford					36,990	222,195	735,215	1,127,425	1,792,684	428,419	119,643	4,462,571
Howard					63,103	15,066	205,676	863,318	2,199,381	499,136	561,386	4,407,066
Kent							133,539	73,425	329,144			536,108
Montgomery					222,415	260,151	2,694,215	5,637,038	3,480,050	2,218,788	1,593,114	16,105,771
P. G.'s				11,937	114,134	49,432	2,321,474	7,444,943	4,310,207	535,021	260,419	15,047,567
Q. A.'s			13,686			19,122	143,808	248,133	140,705	58,248	71,428	695,130
St. Mary's						19,800	251,739	463,666	635,052	154,835	51,910	1,577,002
Somerset							51,852	58,445	409,283	44,133	8,520	572,233
Talbot							236,090	157,138	231,214		25,057	649,499
Washington				16,936	81,964	22,127	789,403	477,246	1,261,381	119,248	28,195	2,796,500
Wicomico					168,500	70,083	481,370	579,112	448,987	108,663	5,985	1,862,700
Worcester							272,898	82,362	472,947	94,104	15,010	937,321
Balto. City	77,404		113,915	1,401,977	1,042,563	66,593	3,372,479	5,652,040	5,922,184	1,050,652	219,110	18,918,917
TOTAL	107,555	42,000	168,133	1,947,139	2,899,285	2,108,574	19,329,140	35,419,565	35,524,266	8,046,443	4,383,910	109,976,010 (2)

NOTES: (1) Dates shown are for original construction and additions. They do not include any renovations.
(2) All figures are gross square footage.

Public School Construction Program
April 1993

MARYLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

FACILITIES INVENTORY
ADJUSTED AGE OF CONSTRUCTION BY DECADE (1)

	1800 1899	1900 1909	1910 1919	1920 1929	1930 1939	1940 1949	1950 1959	1960 1969	1970 1979	1980 1989	1990 1999	TOTAL
Allegany					112,616	40,316	417,609	309,171	666,831	162,476	211,165	1,920,184
A. Arundel	25,948			16,613	10,637	64,481	914,479	2,607,188	5,485,618	1,419,313	271,754	10,816,031
Baltimore		11,390	23,415	219,711	184,251	440,514	3,114,361	5,704,594	3,101,964	883,871	338,353	14,022,424
Calvert						50,525	4,400	23,240	733,402	222,567	212,843	1,246,977
Caroline							78,230	190,570	398,577	83,288		750,665
Carroll				35,500	140,098	98,572	376,778	417,385	1,256,174	472,705	238,487	3,035,699
Cecil				10,070	73,990		396,228	390,815	463,212	216,891	219,280	1,770,486
Charles					7,148	12,976	17,727	667,636	1,155,203	460,140	249,323	2,570,153
Dorchester							30,332	8,778	534,992	208,780	4,205	787,087
Frederick				20,222	4,717		73,594	831,171	1,480,742	1,015,151	336,738	3,762,335
Garrett					5,634	2,071	162,076	73,481	309,734	172,588		725,584
Harford					36,990	222,195	537,540	1,061,090	1,835,134	649,979	119,643	4,462,571
Howard					14,500		8,000	546,287	2,286,084	964,959	587,236	4,407,066
Kent							48,412	60,881	422,695	4,120		536,108
Montgomery					148,781	131,996	1,216,760	4,962,104	4,472,220	2,747,672	2,426,238	16,105,771
P. G.'s				11,937	85,530	49,432	1,686,565	6,797,015	4,858,750	1,163,076	395,262	15,047,567
Q. A.'s			13,686				92,617	228,925	172,835	112,779	74,288	695,130
St. Mary's							177,534	410,923	721,284	189,435	77,826	1,577,002
Somerset								11,765	450,075	101,873	8,520	572,233
Talbot							171,212	129,745	323,485		25,057	649,499
Washington				11,296	28,771	22,127	458,429	620,083	1,367,102	197,426	91,266	2,796,500
Wicomico					61,687	37,238	378,697	512,753	631,102	235,238	5,985	1,862,700
Worcester							25,877	55,756	516,829	323,849	15,010	937,321
Balto. City	77,404		113,915	791,406	776,857	66,593	3,292,841	5,638,881	6,150,075	1,769,485	241,460	18,918,917
TOTAL	103,352	11,390	151,016	1,116,755	1,692,207	1,239,036	13,680,298	32,260,237	39,794,119	13,777,661	6,149,939	109,976,010 (2)

NOTES: (1) Dates shown are for original construction and additions and reflect adjutments for any renovations.
(2) All figures are gross square footage.

Public School Construction Program
April 1993

MARYLAND PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
SUMMARY OF CIP REQUESTS FY '94 - FY '99
($000 omitted)

LEA	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	TOTAL
ALLEGANY	1,906	1,807	1,920	3,262	3,527	2,182	14,604
ANNE ARUNDEL	4,880	23,812	7,515	8,097	9,254	16,150	69,708
BALTIMORE CITY	11,475	12,024	9,133	11,342	12,184	16,976	73,134
BALTIMORE COUNTY	9,846	2,500	11,006	11,113	15,866	17,038	67,369
CALVERT	8,504	4,034	212	840	649	504	14,743
CAROLINE	137	750	1,158	837	-	-	2,882
CARROLL	5,556	16,092	15,372	3,669	6,748	6,641	54,078
CECIL	6,590	5,566	4,821	5,741	5,109	1,970	29,797
CHARLES	3,686	14,875	10,229	15,393	7,031	3,392	54,606
DORCHESTER	231	3,277	563	977	1,592	580	7,220
FREDERICK	11,949	3,635	3,596	3,641	7,078	8,611	38,510
GARRETT	-	-	1,360	-	-	-	1,360
HARFORD	5,754	451	4,655	3,256	3,246	3,261	20,623
HOWARD	37,225	10,946	6,894	2,733	6,894	9,807	74,499
KENT	395	300	150	100	-	-	945
MONTGOMERY	73,422	8,036	15,974	36,949	15,665	19,384	169,430
PRINCE GEORGE'S	8,067	6,637	18,000	20,735	7,806	1,000	62,245
QUEEN ANNE'S	2,067	-	8,669	1,400	1,195	-	13,331
SAINT MARY'S	1,982	16,790	1,258	2,844	8,584	2,525	33,983
SOMERSET	-	687	1,867	-	-	-	2,554
TALBOT	1,389	3,857	711	3,562	1,100	-	10,619
WASHINGTON	7,001	-	874	1,141	5,160	-	14,176
WICOMICO	3,675	4,342	4,500	1,339	3,000	594	17,450
WORCESTER	549	2,025	184	172	116	-	3,046
Total State [1]	206,286	142,443	130,621	139,143	121,804	110,615	850,912
Total State Adj.[2]	206,286	149,565	144,010	161,072	148,053	141,178	950,164

(1) All projects at estimated July 1993 cost with no adjustment for inflation in subsequent years.

(2) Totals adjusted for inflation from July 1993 at 5 percent per year (compounded).

Source: Public School Construction Program (FY'94 CIP)

Revised 4/21/93

Appendix H

Public School Enrollments and Capacities

State of Maryland

A. School Age Population

The school age population (persons 5 to 17 years of age), which declined from 1,037,160 in 1970 to 895,256 in 1980 continued to decline by an additional 90,833 to 804,423 in 1990. Elementary school age population, however, has already started to increase and the school age population will continue to increase as the larger number of persons under five years of age enter school in the 1990s. There are 357,818 children under five years compared to just 272,274 in 1980, reflecting the "baby boomlet" of the 1980s and the "baby bust" of the 1970s.

B. Public School Enrollment K-12

	1970	1980	1990	2000*
K-5	446,296	308,998	356,577	396,070
6-8	203,527	175,738	155,397	207,860
9-12	240,036	249,416	181,908	241,260
6-12 Sp. Ed.	21,186	11,004	6,934	9,810
TOTALS	911,045	745,156	700,816	855,000

*Based on 1991 actual enrollments

C. Public School Capacities

	Existing Capacity *	Requests: Additional Capacity		LEA Proposed Total Capacity**
		NEW	ADDITIONS	
Elementary	451,454	18,458	8,250	478,162
Middle	200,562	15,137	2,779	218,478
High	233,008	10,845	6,189	250,042

* through 1/27/93 - planning or construction approved
** through FY'99

Source: Maryland Office of Planning
February 18, 1993

Appendix I

Revised 4/21/93

SUMMARY OF OUTSTANDING
LEA CONSTRUCTION REQUESTS
FY 1994 THROUGH FY 1999
($000)

LEA	TOTAL	A	B	C
ALLEGANY	11,060	183	10,877	-
ANNE ARUNDEL	68,898	33,514	24,207	11,177
BALTIMORE CITY	61,887	26,249	35,225	413
BALTIMORE COUNTY	65,193	41,950	2,115	21,128
CALVERT	5,619	4,226	1,393	-
CAROLINE	1,010	98	75	837
CARROLL	50,517	18,623	11,509	20,385
CECIL	25,610	22,901	2,274	435
CHARLES	52,628	48,069	4,559	-
DORCHESTER	6,961	6,453	375	133
FREDERICK	34,377	20,368	6,982	7,027
GARRETT	1,360	-	1,360	-
HARFORD	17,178	4,547	127	12,504
HOWARD	72,016	62,738	6,545	2,733
KENT	750	750	-	-
MONTGOMERY	167,042	131,476	29,023	6,543
PRINCE GEORGE'S	79,209	36,744	37,173	5,292
QUEEN ANNE'S	12,021	4,116	-	7,905
ST. MARY'S	33,071	16,908	-	16,163
SOMERSET	2,554	2,554	-	-
TALBOT	10,618	5,661	4,957	-
WASHINGTON	13,632	5,874	3,678	4,080
WICOMICO	13,775	4,339	4,936	4,500
WORCESTER	2,844	1,174	1,670	-
TOTAL STATE	**809,830**	**499,515**	**189,060**	**121,255**

EXPLANATION OF CODES

A **Expected to proceed**. Appears to be eligible for funding. Possible questions will relate to project scope or capacity but not to eligibility. Project can be expected to proceed normally.

B **Questions, existing or potential**. Significant questions exist or may arise as to project's local support, appropriate scope and capacity, advisability as currently proposed. Project could proceed normally once questions are resolved.

C **Should not proceed**. Project is of questionable need, low priority, or doubtful eligibility.

NOTES

1. All amounts are in July, 1993 dollars as submitted in the LEA's FY '94 CIP.

2. Project amounts reflect requests for State-funded construction and systemic renovations. Projects in the FY '94 CIP approved for funding by the Board of Public Works on January 27, 1993 are excluded from this list.

3. The Board of Public Works approved additional funding on April 21, 1993 in the amount of $42m thereby reducing the "A" column total to approximately $460m.

Source: Maryland Office of Planning, February 18, 1993

FORWARD FUNDED PROJECTS
($000 omitted)

PRIORITY	PROJECT	TYPE	PROG. CODE	LEA ESTIMATE
BALTIMORE CO				
3	Lutherville E.	LP/C2	B	1,735
4	Hillcrest E.	LP/C1	C	410
CARROLL				
3	Piney Ridge E.	C1	B	2,547[1]
6	Sandymount E.	LP1	B	1,905[1]
FREDERICK				
2	Spring Ridge E.	C1	B	1,881[1]
HOWARD				
2	New Western H.	LP/C1	B	9,552[2]
4	Northfield E.	C4	B	332[1]
5	Centennial Lane E.	C1	B	205[1]
6	St. John's Lane E.	C1	B	96[1]
12	Bollman Bridge E.	LP/C1	C	485
13	Glenelg H.	LP/C3	B	2,858
14	Waterloo E.	LP/C3	B	1,347
15	Bushey Park E.	LP/C4	B	467
16	Laurel Woods E.	LP/C1	B	266
17	Hammond E./M.	LP/C1	B	1,415
18	Lisbon E.	LP/C1	B	275
19	Clemens Crossing E.	LP/C1	B	275
20	Swansfield E.	LP/C4	C	965
21	Thunder Hill E.	LP/C3	C	501
22	Phelps Luck E.	LP/C3	C	433
23	Worthington E.	LP/C1	B	392
MONTGOMERY				
1	Springbrook H.	LP/C1	B	7,990[2]
3	Oakland Terrace E.	LP/C3	C	1,198
4	Burtonsville E.	LP/C1	B	1,451[2]
5	Forest Knolls E.	LP/C1	C	1,122
6	Monocacy E.	LP/C3	C	264
11	Sherwood H.	LP/C3	C	5,000
12	Bel Pre E.	LP/C4	B	84
13	Sligo M.	LP/C3	B	3,539
14	Rock Creek Forest E.	LP/C2	C	538
15	Burning Tree E.	LP/C3	B	741
16	Viers Mill Road E.	LP/C2	C	1,539
17	Walt Whitman H.	LP/C1	C	6,507
18	Brooke Grove E.	C1	B	2,281[1]
19	Watkins Mill H.	C1	B	7,274[1]
20	Broad Acres E.	LP/C3	B	326
21	Burnt Mills E.	LP/C3	B	1,034
22	Cloverly E.	LP/C3	B	1,244
23	Cresthaven E.	LP/C1	B	89
24	E. Silver Spring E.	LP/C	B	409
25	Gaithersburg M. #1	LP/C3	B	2,175
26	Galway E.	LP/C1	B	29
27	Highland E.	LP/C1	B	730
28	Francis Scott Key M.	LP/C3	B	596
29	Laytonsville E.	LP/C2	B	983
30	Luxmanor E.	LP/C1	B	609
31	Montgomery Knolls E.	LP/C1	C	1,002
32	New Hampshire Estates E.	LP/C1	C	796
33	Olney E.	LP/C1	B	1,835
34	Paint Branch H.	LP/C1	C	2,437
35	Rolling Terrace E.	LP/C1	C	2,270

FORWARD FUNDED PROJECTS
($000 omitted)
(Cont'd)

PRIORITY	PROJECT	TYPE	PROG. CODE	LEA ESTIMATE
MONTGOMERY				
36	Rosemary Hills E.	LP/C1	B	1,430
37	Stedwick E.	LP/C1	B	153
38	Twinbrook E.	LP/C2	B	700
39	Woodlin E.	LP/C1	B	244
40	Bannockburn E.	LP3	B	302[3]
41	Beall E.	LP3	C	282[3]
42	Cedar Grove E.	LP1	B	1,151[3]
43	Clarksburg E.	LP2	C	421[3]
St. Mary's				
1	Park Hall E.	LP/C1	B	1,861[2]
Washington				
1	Boonsboro E.	C1	B	1,363[1]
2	Eastern E.	LP/C1	C	2,442
		TOTAL		$94,783

[1] Approved for planning prior fiscal year, project requires pay-go funds ($15,979,000).
[2] Recommended for planning approval FY '94, Bond funds can be utilized ($20,854,000).
[3] LEA did not request construction funds in FY '94 ($4,061,000).

Source: Maryland Office of Planning
December 11, 1992

Appendix K

PUPIL-TEACHER RATIOS
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

	KINDERGARTEN			GRADES 1-5/6		
LEA	AVERAGE	HIGH OF	LOW OF	AVERAGE	HIGH OF	LOW OF
Allegany	20:1	26:1	10:1	25:1	28:1	23:1
Anne Arundel	21:1	35:1	11:1	25:1	28:1	20:1
Baltimore	24:1	29:1	16:1	25:1	27:1	21:1
Calvert	25:1	27:1	24:1	25:1	24:1	24:1
Caroline	21:1	26:1	20:1	24:1	25:1	22:1
Carroll	20:1	29:1	19:1	25:1	26:1	24:1
Cecil	23:1	29:1	17:1	25:1	27:1	21:1
Charles	18:1	29:1	13:1	24:1	28:1	15:1
Dorchester	21:1	30:1	16:1	23:1	26:1	18:1
Frederick	23:1	28:1	14:1	24:1	25:1	21:1
Garrett	22:1	26:1	15:1	22:1	23:1	17:1
Harford	18:1	21:1	13:1	24:1	26:1	19:1
Howard	21:1	25:1	15:1	25:1	31:1	19:1
Kent	21:1	26:1	18:1	19:1	20:1	16:1
Montgomery	22:1	27:1	13:1	24:1	27:1	21:1
Prince George's	15:1	35:1	8:1	27:1	33:1	18:1
Queen Anne's	20:1	23:1	17:1	23:1	22:1	19:1
St. Mary's	21:1	25:1	18:1	20:1	26:1	12:1
Somerset	21:1	22:1	16:1	23:1	25:1	11:1
Talbot	18:1	20:1	13:1	22:1	26:1	17:1
Washington	21:1	28:1	15:1	24:1	27:1	20:1
Wicomico	17:1	22:1	13:1	24:1	26:1	22:1
Worcester	19:1	20:1	19:1	22:1	23:1	21:1
Baltimore City	26:1	59:1	9:1	27:1	60:1	15:1

Source: Maryland Office of Planning
May 5, 1993

Appendix L

Pre-Kindergarten Education

The chart below provides the historical and estimated numbers of children from a particular birth year through enrollment in public or private first (1st) grade. In reviewing the data, the following points need to be kept in mind:

1. Assume that all first graders are 6 years old.
2. Assume that all kindergarten students are 5 years old.
3. First grade and kindergarten enrollments are those reported to Maryland State Department of Education as of September 30th and include both public and private schools.
4. First grade and kindergarten enrollments do not include special education students enrolled in schools.

Birth Year		4 Year Olds	5 Year Olds (K)	6 Year Olds (1st)
1984	65,274	65,467** (1988)	65,825 (1989)	71,638 (1990)
1985	67,985	67,385** (1989)	68,675 (1990)	72,496 (1991)
1986	69,524	70,558 (1990)	69,677 (1991)	71,311* (1992)
1987	72,501	70,376** (1991)	UA (1992)	UA (1993)
1988	76,414	72,716** (1992)	UA (1993)	UA (1994)

* Estimated. Based on 1992 actual public school enrollments. Increased by 13.9% to account for private school enrollments which have not yet been reported.

** Estimated. Based on actual number of 5 year olds and 6 year olds in 1990 with a total migration propensity for persons 0-4 factor applied. 1985-90 migration rates were used.

Source: Maryland Office of Planning
Public School Construction Program

11/12/92

PRE-KINDERGARTEN EDUCATION*
Maryland Public Schools

COUNTY	1990 PRE-K STUDENTS	1991 PRE-K STUDENTS	1992 PRE-K STUDENTS
Allegany	80	80	80
Anne Arundel	376	375	390
Baltimore City	4545	4933	4777
Baltimore	1080	1280	1800
Calvert	160	160	160
Caroline	38	31	40
Carroll	74	115	161
Cecil	214	214	220
Charles	200	240	320
Dorchester	234	233	213
Frederick	160	229	261
Garrett	52	44	88
Harford	416	420	397
Howard	0	0	0
Kent	120	120	136
Montgomery	1286	1720	1718
Prince George's	1032	1294	1267
Queen Anne's	80	120	132
St. Mary's	313	320	340
Somerset	125	133	125
Talbot	80	100	80
Washington	301	331	358
Wicomico	80	146	119
Worcester	40	80	80
TOTAL	11,086	12,718	13,262
Number of Schools	307	329	346

*Data from LEA's based upon 9/30 enrollment.

TASK FORCE ON SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

NOVEMBER 12, 1992

PREKINDERGARTEN - FACILITY IMPACT (estimate)

Assumptions

(1) 12,000 pre-K students

(2) All attend ½ day session

(3) All classes are in groups of 20 children

(4) All existing elementary schools are at or projected to be (within 5 years) at capacity

OPTION 1 - Added pre-K classrooms to existing elementary school buildings

12,000 (students) ÷ 2 (½ day session) = 6,000 FTE students (full-time equivalent)

6,000 (FTE) ÷ 20 (class size) = 300 classrooms required

300 classrooms x 1200 sq ft (per room) x $78.35 per sq ft = $28,206,000 (total cost)

OPTION 2 - Place pre-K students in existing schools which creates a need for additional schools.

6,000 FTE students ÷ 600 students per school = 10 new elementary schools

10 schools x 54,000 sq ft (per school) x $87.75 per sq ft = $47,385,000 (total cost)

Summary for 12,000 pre-K children
($000 omitted)

	TOTAL COST	STATE* COST	LOCAL COST
OPTION 1 (Additions)	$28,206	$16,924	$11,282
OPTION 2 (New Schools)	47,385	28,431	18,954

Summary for 30,000 pre-K children

OPTION 1 (Additions)	$ 70,515	$42,309	$28,206
OPTION 2 (New Schools)	118,462	71,078	47,385

*Assumes State average cost 60%

STATE AID AS A PERCENT OF BASIC CURRENT EXPENSE PROGRAM
FY 1986 - 1988

CO ID	COUNTY	FY 1986 % ST SHR	FY 1987 % ST SHR	FY 1988 % ST SHR	3-YR AVG % ST SHR	3-YR AVG ROUNDED %	For Purposes of School Construction: ASSIGNED CATEGORY	For Purposes of School Construction: TOTAL STATE % SHARE
24	WORCESTER	.114	.036	.033	.061	.06	1	.50
16	MONTGOMERY	.189	.193	.184	.189	.19	1	.50
21	TALBOT	.236	.239	.240	.238	.24	1	.50
4	BALTIMORE	.366	.368	.364	.366	.37	1	.50
5	CALVERT	.405	.431	.458	.431	.43	1	.50
14	HOWARD	.441	.444	.430	.438	.44	1	.50
2	ANNE ARUNDEL	.541	.528	.527	.532	.53	2	.55
15	KENT	.545	.539	.536	.540	.54	2	.55
18	QUEEN ANNE'S	.549	.544	.545	.546	.55	2	.55
17	PRINCE GEORGE'S	.565	.559	.558	.561	.56	2	.55
7	CARROLL	.622	.626	.635	.628	.63	3	.65
11	FREDERICK	.627	.630	.637	.631	.63	3	.65
9	CHARLES	.648	.636	.640	.641	.64	3	.65
22	WASHINGTON	.642	.642	.643	.642	.64	3	.65
13	HARFORD	.644	.649	.649	.647	.65	3	.65
23	WICOMICO	.646	.652	.657	.652	.65	3	.65
10	DORCHESTER	.665	.657	.659	.660	.66	3	.65
19	ST. MARY'S	.667	.665	.666	.666	.67	3	.65
1	ALLEGANY	.670	.679	.683	.677	.68	3	.65
8	CECIL	.709	.708	.705	.707	.71	4	.75
3	BALTIMORE CITY	.708	.707	.708	.708	.71	4	.75
12	GARRETT	.714	.712	.711	.712	.71	4	.75
6	CAROLINE	.739	.738	.740	.739	.74	4	.75
20	SOMERSET	.743	.739	.743	.742	.74	4	.75
	STATEWIDE	.522	.519	.517	.519	.52		

NOTES:

- The Basic Current Expense Formula is a State/local shared funding formula. The basic program amount under the formula is the product of FTE(enrollment) & a per pupil foundation amount. The formula distributes State aid per student inverse to local wealth per student. The " % ST SHR" reflects the amount of the basic program funded by the State.

Source: Md. State Dept. of Educ, Comptroller of the Treasury & Dept. of Assessments & Taxation

AIDPCT
A1-Y48
01/20/93
1-21-50

Printed: 02/03/93
Revised: 02/03/93

Schedule of State Share Percentage of Basic Current Expenses

LOCAL UNIT	FY 1985	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY 1994 (ESTIM'D)	FY 1995 (ESTIM'D)
ALLEGANY	0.670	0.670	0.679	0.683	0.696	0.710	0.718	0.713	0.704	0.706	0.699
ANNE ARUNDEL	0.550	0.541	0.529	0.528	0.523	0.516	0.504	0.494	0.488	0.470	0.465
BALTIMORE CITY	0.705	0.708	0.707	0.708	0.707	0.707	0.712	0.718	0.724	0.734	0.730
BALTIMORE	0.378	0.366	0.368	0.365	0.363	0.376	0.384	0.397	0.405	0.422	0.424
CALVERT	0.375	0.405	0.431	0.459	0.469	0.497	0.512	0.557	0.523	0.515	0.526
CAROLINE	0.745	0.739	0.738	0.740	0.742	0.745	0.741	0.750	0.746	0.744	0.741
CARROLL	0.616	0.622	0.627	0.635	0.636	0.635	0.630	0.627	0.618	0.618	0.622
CECIL	0.711	0.709	0.708	0.705	0.704	0.701	0.692	0.682	0.672	0.661	0.662
CHARLES	0.656	0.648	0.637	0.640	0.640	0.640	0.638	0.635	0.634	0.630	0.631
DORCHESTER	0.662	0.665	0.657	0.659	0.664	0.668	0.662	0.661	0.659	0.660	0.656
FREDERICK	0.620	0.627	0.630	0.638	0.634	0.630	0.625	0.609	0.606	0.607	0.608
GARRETT	0.703	0.714	0.712	0.711	0.718	0.716	0.709	0.705	0.693	0.684	0.675
HARFORD	0.646	0.644	0.649	0.649	0.649	0.644	0.641	0.642	0.637	0.633	0.626
HOWARD	0.441	0.441	0.444	0.437	0.433	0.409	0.408	0.400	0.406	0.410	0.426
KENT	0.539	0.545	0.540	0.537	0.516	0.531	0.520	0.520	0.498	0.480	0.473
MONTGOMERY	0.195	0.189	0.194	0.186	0.178	0.177	0.165	0.166	0.163	0.156	0.168
PRINCE GEORGE'S	0.565	0.565	0.560	0.557	0.566	0.566	0.574	0.568	0.567	0.564	0.563
QUEEN ANNE'S	0.548	0.549	0.544	0.546	0.537	0.544	0.523	0.523	0.514	0.513	0.521
ST. MARY'S	0.670	0.667	0.665	0.667	0.670	0.671	0.665	0.663	0.658	0.644	0.643
SOMERSET	0.744	0.743	0.739	0.743	0.747	0.746	0.756	0.760	0.757	0.762	0.755
TALBOT	0.242	0.236	0.240	0.241	0.197	0.211	0.198	0.220	0.202	0.192	0.188
WASHINGTON	0.633	0.642	0.642	0.644	0.648	0.649	0.650	0.652	0.646	0.654	0.650
WICOMICO	0.639	0.646	0.653	0.651	0.659	0.667	0.670	0.672	0.674	0.679	0.675
WORCESTER	0.144	0.114	0.025	0.033	0.030	0.028	0.026	0.036	0.065	0.091	0.099
TOTAL STATE				0.518	0.516	0.515	0.513	0.512	0.510	0.510	0.509

M-2

92

93

This schedule was prepared by the MSDE Budget Branch on 01/20/92, Based on Calculations available for the fiscal years requested.
The fiscal year 1995 figures were updated on 02/03/93 and represent rough estimates only.
It is unknown if these calculations match actual payments for those fiscal years.

AIDPCT
A1-Y48
01/20/93
I-21-50

Printed: 02/03/93

Schedule of State Share Percentage of Basic Current Expenses
Three Year Moving Averages

LOCAL UNIT	FY 89/91 TO FY 91 AVERAGE	FY 90/92 TO FY 92 AVERAGE	FY 91/93 TO FY 93 AVERAGE	FY 92/94 TO FY 94 AVG (EST)	FY 93/95 TO FY 95 AVG (EST)
ALLEGANY	0.708	0.714	0.712	0.708	0.703
ANNE ARUNDEL	0.514	0.505	0.496	0.484	0.474
BALTIMORE CITY	0.708	0.712	0.718	0.725	0.729
BALTIMORE	0.374	0.386	0.396	0.408	0.417
CALVERT	0.493	0.522	0.531	0.532	0.521
CAROLINE	0.743	0.745	0.746	0.747	0.744
CARROLL	0.633	0.630	0.625	0.621	0.619
CECIL	0.699	0.691	0.682	0.672	0.665
CHARLES	0.639	0.638	0.636	0.633	0.631
DORCHESTER	0.665	0.664	0.660	0.660	0.658
FREDERICK	0.630	0.621	0.613	0.607	0.607
GARRETT	0.714	0.710	0.702	0.694	0.684
HARFORD	0.645	0.642	0.640	0.637	0.632
HOWARD	0.417	0.406	0.405	0.405	0.414
KENT	0.522	0.524	0.513	0.499	0.483
MONTGOMERY	0.173	0.169	0.165	0.161	0.162
PRINCE GEORGE'S	0.569	0.569	0.570	0.566	0.565
QUEEN ANNE'S	0.535	0.530	0.520	0.517	0.516
ST. MARY'S	0.669	0.666	0.662	0.655	0.648
SOMERSET	0.750	0.754	0.758	0.760	0.758
TALBOT	0.202	0.210	0.207	0.205	0.194
WASHINGTON	0.649	0.650	0.649	0.650	0.650
WICOMICO	0.666	0.670	0.672	0.675	0.676
WORCESTER	0.028	0.030	0.042	0.064	0.085
TOTAL STATE	0.515	0.513	0.512	0.511	0.510

This schedule was prepared by the MSDE Budget Branch on 02/03/92, Based on Calculations available for the fiscal years requested.
The fiscal year 1995 figures were updated on 02/03/93 and represent rough estimates only.
It is unknown if these calculations match actual payments for those fiscal years.

M-3

94

95

EA025719

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Report of the Governor's Task Force on School Construction	
Author(s): State of Maryland	
Corporate Source: Interagency Committee on School Construction	Publication Date: July 30, 1993

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

[X] ← Sample sticker to be affixed to document

Check here
Permitting microfiche (4"x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sample
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

Sample sticker to be affixed to document →

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sample
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

[ ]

or here
Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Yale Stenzler	Position: Executive Director
Printed Name: Dr. Yale Stenzler	Organization: Public School Construction Program
Address: 200 W. Baltimore Street Baltimore MD 21201	Telephone Number: (410) 333-2505
	Date: March 22, 1994

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC , *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of this document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS).

Publisher/Distributor:	
Address:	
Price Per Copy:	Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

If you are making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, you may return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Facility
1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 300
Rockville, Maryland 20850-4305
Telephone: (301) 258-5500

(Rev. 9/91)